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III. Significance of this volume
Contrastive research has the merit of bringing to light new facts of a given language that would go unnoticed if the researcher’s eyes were limited exclusively to that language. In fact, the Japanese language has a long tradition of contrastive studies with special reference to English and other major Western languages as well as to neighboring languages in Asia, especially Korean and Chinese, and has brought forth an abundance of new discoveries from a variety of theoretical, descriptive, and typological perspectives.
Dedicated to contrastive and typological studies on Japanese and some selected languages of the world, The Handbook of Japanese Contrastive Linguistics is a unique publication that brings together insights from three traditions—Japanese linguistics, linguistic typology and contrastive linguistics—and makes important contributions to deepening our understanding of various phenomena in Japanese as well other languages of the globe. Its primary goal is to uncover principled similarities and differences between Japanese and other languages of the globe and thereby shed new light on the universal as well as language-particular properties of Japanese. The issues addressed by the 30-odd papers in this volume cover a wide spectrum of phenomena ranging from lexical to syntactic and discourse levels. The authors of the chapters, leading scholars in their respective field of research, present the state-of-the-art research from their respected field.

To date, no such publication of comparable depth and breadth is available for the other languages. This handbook would thus be a valuable reference for both theoretical and descriptive linguists, topologists, Japanese-language educators, and students working on Japanese. Besides Japan, the US, Asia, Europe and Australia would be the potential markets for this handbook.

IV. Organization of the book

The book consists of two parts. Part I deals with a variety of lexical, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects of Japanese from typological perspectives while Part II focuses on contrastive studies between Japanese and various languages of the globe dealing with various lexical, semantic, and syntactic phenomena. The book comprises a total of 36 chapters: 13 chapters in Part I and 23 chapters in Part II. The chapters in Part I are arranged roughly in an increasing order of the ‘linguistic sizes’ of the objects of their inquiry, from word-level topics to syntactic constructions to discourse-related matters while those in Part II are arranged according to geographical locations of the languages with which Japanese is contrasted.

V. Table of contents

INTRODUCTION ................. Prashant Pardeshi and Taro Kageyama

PART I: TYPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

1. Inalienable possession .............................................. Tasaku Tsunoda (NINJAL, emeritus)
Possession is commonly classified into two types: inalienable (i.e. inherent or inborn) possession such as someone’s body parts and alienable (non-inherent or acquired) possession such as someone’s tools. This semantic classification is reflected in the morphosyntax of many if not all languages. The expressions that represent inalienable possession exhibit special morphosyntactic properties that are not observed in the expressions of alienable possession. In this chapter, it is argued that the distinction of alienable and inalienable possession is not a clear-cut dichotomy but forms a cline. Various types of possessee can be placed on the continuum ranging from inalienable to alienable possession. However, their relative order is not uniform across languages. This chapter will enquire whether this variation is accidental or indicative of differences in cognition of the extralinguistic world.

2. Measure Nouns ..................................................... Akira Watanabe (University of Tokyo)
Measure nouns in Japanese exhibit a curious property of being linked directly to a numeral without the mediation of a classifier, as in yon meeteru ‘four meters’, unlike ordinary nouns in the language. In this chapter, I will show that this peculiarity is explained away once a cross-linguistic perspective is taken. Typological studies observe that measure nouns tend to
lack plural marking. Japanese measure nouns can be made to fit this pattern if the feature content of measure nouns and classifiers is taken into account. Comparison with numerical bases is particularly illuminating in this respect, since they also tend to be devoid of plural marking cross-linguistically and are combined with a basic numeral without the help of a classifier in Japanese (as in *yon hyaku* ‘four hundred’). This comparison brings to light the fact that measure nouns and numerical bases in Japanese share the ability to allow “1”-deletion, which has been associated only with numerical bases in the cross-linguistic survey. The overall analysis will highlight the significant role that number features play in this domain.

3. Numeral classifiers .............................. Yoshihiro Nishimitsu (Kobe University, emeritus)

Numeral classifiers, geographically limited to the languages of Asia and the Americas, are obligatorily required when numerals are used. Different classifiers are used depending on the shape and other characteristics of the entities counted, as in *hiki* for animals (e.g. *4-hiki no inu* ‘4-classifier POSS dog’, 4 dogs), and *mai* for two dimensional objects (*4-mai no kami* ‘4-classifier POSS paper’, 4 sheets of paper). This chapter discusses the nature of Japanese numeral classifiers from a cognitive-typological viewpoint. The previous literature on the phenomenon can be classified into four major categories: (i) studies on numeral classifiers from experimental methods by cognitive psychologists (Imai), (ii) cognitive-semantic analyses of numeral classifiers (Yo Matsumoto, George Lakoff, Fujii), (iii) historical studies on numeral classifiers (Miho), and (iv) dialectal variation of numeral classifiers (Hiroshima group). By locating these studies within the perspectives of typological research on the systems of numbers and numeral classifiers (Aikhenvald), this chapter attempts to clarify the relationship between number systems and numeral classifier systems, the peculiarities of the Japanese numeral classifier system as contrasted with those of other languages, and the influence of the level of abstraction of basic-level categories on the granularity level of numeral classifiers.

4. Spatial Deixis ....................................................... Shingo Imai (University of Tsukuba)

Spatial deixis is a reflection of spatial perception, a basic cognitive ability of humans. Spatial deixis has been extensively investigated in Japanese, which has a three-way distinction, as opposed to the two-way distinctions in English and many other European languages. The three-way system of Japanese is a typical one from a cross-linguistic point of view. Fillmore (1982), Anderson and Keenan (1985), and Diessel (1999) brought forth parameters of spatial deixis based on descriptions in reference grammars, whereas Levinson (2003) and Levinson and Wilkins (2006) provided frameworks for the description of spatial expressions. The present chapter widens the data samples to 432 languages. Experimental data have been collected from informants of 15 languages to explicate fine-grained semantics of spatial deixis. Cross-linguistic comparison reveals differences in the three-way systems of Japanese, Korean, and Spanish. Universal parameters and implicational universals are also proposed.

5. Motion Typology .................................Yo Matsumoto (Kobe University)

The semantic properties of spatial and motion expressions in Japanese are examined in light of general-linguistic and typological studies of spatial expressions (Jackendoff 1983, Talmy 2000, Levinson 2003) and motion expressions (Talmy 1991, Matsumoto 2003). Previous works by Susumu Yamada and Tatsuo Miyajima as well as more recent ones by theoretically oriented researchers including Shinohara and myself are critically reviewed. As for spatial expressions it is pointed out that Japanese exhibits analytic expressions of different components of spatial notions, such as Conformation (e.g. IN) and Vector (e.g. TO). It also employs verbal means to indicate what some other languages represent by adpositions, to compensate for its rather poor adpositional repertoire. The choice of the spatial reference frames used in Japanese is also discussed, paying attention to regional differences. The nature of motion expressions in Japanese is closely examined within typological frameworks, with special focus on causative motion events and other events that involve abstract motion.
6. Voice .................................................. Ryuichi Washio (Gakushuin University)
This chapter will discuss some fundamental properties of voice-related constructions in Japanese, including the nature of ‘multiple voice-conversion’. Given that the ‘passive’ morpheme rare has four distinct uses (PASSIVE, SPONTANEOUS, POTENTIAL, and HONORIFIC), there should be twenty-five possibilities of combining rare and the causative sase in a direct sequence, e.g., CAUSATIVE+POTENTIAL, PASSIVE+SPONTANEOUS, etc. The permissibility of all the logically possible combinations of sase and rare will be examined, with special focus on the combinations PASSIVE+CAUSATIVE and PASSIVE+PASSIVE in Japanese, Korean, Turkish, Mongolian, and other languages. We will then proceed to discuss some peculiar properties of Japanese passives. In particular, the nature of the so-called ‘indirect passives’ is discussed in light of the fact that they are extremely rare among languages of the world and are often expressed in other languages using CAUSATIVE constructions. The peculiarity of indirect passives in Japanese will be derived from the historical origin of rare as a transitive verb.

7. Transitivity .................................................. Prashant Pardeshi (NINJAL)
As Hopper and Thompson (1982:1) point out, the notion of transitivity lies at the explanatory core of most grammatical processes in perhaps all languages of the world, and Japanese is no exception. This chapter first presents a review of some important typological studies on transitivity (Lakoff 1972, Hopper and Thompson 1980, Tsunoda 1985, Lazar 1998) and selected seminal works on transitivity alternations in Japanese (Moto-ori Haruniwa 1828, Gonda 1884, Okutsu 1967, Nishio 1982, Hayatsu 1989, Jacobsen 1992, Kageyama 1996), highlighting the important insights they offer. Examination of intriguing cases of deviation from the semantic prototype of transitivity such as non-intentional events (e.g. Taro ga kata o kowasita. ‘Taro damaged his arm’), indirect causation (Watasi wa i no syuzyutu o sita. ‘I had an operation on my stomach’), non-controllable states (Biiru ga suki-da. ‘I like beer’, Okane ga hoshii. ‘I want money’), and agent-concealing events (Orinpikku no kaisaiti ga kimatta. ‘The wall collapsed because of a storm’ ) brings to light similarities and differences between Japanese and other languages including English, Hindi-Urdu, and Marathi.

8. Resultative constructions .................... Taro Kageyama (NINJAL) and Li Shen (Doshisha University)
Resultative constructions, exemplified by English sentences like (i) He broke the glass to pieces, (ii) She shook her husband awake, and (iii) He ran his sneakers ragged, where the resultative phrases are underscored, are one of the most hotly debated topics in the recent literature on the interactions of semantics, syntax, and pragmatics. It is well known that not all languages have the three types of resultatives exemplified above. After selectively reviewing the seminal works on the English resultative constructions, this chapter will explain why Japanese allows only the type (i) resultatives and flatly rejects types (ii) and (iii), from the viewpoints of the lexical semantics of main verbs and the lexico-pragmatic implications of the whole verb phrases. For this purpose, an implicational universal based on the qualia structure of main verbs is suggested to account for the typological diversity of resultative constructions in a variety of languages. Outside the Germanic branch, Chinese is a rare case that manifests all of the English-type resultatives by means of compound verbs. The uniqueness of Chinese is explained away by assuming that the second element in a resultative compound verb is derived from an English-type syntactic structure by reference to the lexical and pragmatic implications of the verb phrases involved.

9. Nominalization ................................. Masayoshi Shibatani (Rice University)
This chapter examines the morphosyntactic and usage patterns of nominalizations in Japanese and compares them with those seen across a wide variety of languages. Data are organized according to the types and functions of nominalization in order to ascertain the form-function correlations across languages. The relevant distinctions in the form and the function are (i) types
(verb-based vs. noun-based, lexical vs. grammatical, argument vs. event) and (ii) functions (NP-use, Modification-use, Complementation-use). The chapter aims to draw cross-linguistic generalizations over the following formal properties: (a) morphological marking patterns across different types and (b) marking patterns across different functions. The clear distinction drawn between type and function obviates many morphosyntactic categories such as the Genitive case, the complementizer, possessive pronouns, adjectival pronouns, and relative clauses. It also identifies different kinds of markers used in nominalization, which are often confused in the literature. This is primarily a synchronic cross-linguistic study, but a diachronic stance will also be taken in understanding the development of nominalization markers and the functional specializations of form over time.

10. Clausal noun-modifying constructions .......... Yoshiko Matsumoto (Stanford University) and Bernard Comrie (Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology/University of California, Santa Barbara)

Clausal noun-modifying constructions (NMCs), which include what are generally referred to as relative clauses and noun-complement constructions, have been a central issue in linguistics partly because of their wide distribution across languages. However, research has as yet been predominantly based on English, often with the assumption that the findings should be viewed as universal. An in-depth examination of naturally-occurring NMCs in Japanese (Yoshiko Matsumoto 1997) questioned the universality of the partitioning between relative clauses and noun complements that has been assumed, and led to a radically different analytical framework that incorporates an aggregate of factors, including consideration of the semantics and pragmatics of the head noun and of the subordinate predicate. Comrie (1998) observes that a number of other areally-related languages of Eurasia (e.g., Korean, Chinese, Ainu, Khmer, Tamil, and Karachay-Balkar), irrespective of genetic affiliation, appear to present Japanese-type NMCs, suggesting that the phenomenon has broad significance for linguistic research. This chapter will thus suggest that the phenomenon that at first looked peculiar to Japanese has broad significance for general linguistic research.

11. Subordination ...................................................... Kaoru Horie (Nagoya University)

Subordination is a functional domain that exhibits rich cross-linguistic variation. This chapter first reviews typological literature on subordination (e.g. Foley and Van Valin 1984, Cristofaro 2003) as well as a selection of seminal descriptive and theoretical studies on subordination in Japanese (e.g. Mikami 1953, Minami 1974, 1993). It then presents characteristics of subordination phenomena in Japanese from the viewpoint of functional typology. By incorporating the insights of functional/typological works on the non-discrete nature of subordination phenomena and the notion of ‘finiteness’ (e.g. Ross 1973, Croft 2001, Bisang 2007, Horie 2011), this chapter argues for the form-function continuum of subordinate clauses that crosscuts the traditional ‘discrete’ categorization of relative, complement, and adverbial clauses. The analytical focus will be placed on (i) the status of adverbial clauses in Japanese and their formal-functional affinity with more ‘nominal’ subordinate clauses (relative and complement) as well as with main clauses (independent sentence), and (ii) the use of a subordinate clause as a main clause, i.e. ‘insubordination’ (Evans 2007), which is extensively observed in Japanese.

12. Clause-hood, finiteness and (co)subordination of converbs .............. Shinjiro Kazama (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies)

This chapter aims to reassess the three analogous concepts—‘clause-hood’, ‘finiteness’, and ‘(co)subordination’—from a cross-linguistic perspective. Traditionally, Japanese grammarians distinguish between a sentence, which ends with a predicate that has modality, and the predicate phrase, which does not (Yamada 1936, etc). Another characteristic of Japanese linguistics with regard to the definition of the sentence and other relevant units is that the sentence, clause, phrase, and word are thought to lie on a continuum rather than on a discrete, quadripartite scale.
Here, the central component of any construction is the predicate (Minami 1974, etc). Some articles in Haspelmath & König (1995) refer to converbs as derived verb forms. Haspelmath (1995: 3) contrasts participles and converbs in such a way that the former are verbal adjectives whereas the latter are verbal adverbs. In European languages, participles and converbs are generally like adjectives and adverbs respectively, especially in regard to their morphological coding. They are thus often thought of as being derivational in that they have changed their word classes (cf. word-class-changing inflection or transpositional inflection). In Japanese, however, what would be regarded as ‘converbs’ are not easily identified as derivational, since they retain verbal features and take case-marked arguments. On the other hand, it is also true that Japanese converbs are not like a typical finite verb forms in the sense of Western linguistics, because they are not marked in person, tense, or mood. This chapter suggests that the inflectional system of Japanese verbs centers primarily on what might be called ‘dependency’. Tense and mood marking are unnecessary in Japanese dependent clauses involving converbs. I propose that the inflectional system of a language heavily depends on the syntactic characteristic of the language, especially on the clause combining strategies of the language.

13. Modality ..................... Heiko Narrog (Tohoku University / NINJAL)

In Japanese linguistics there has been a rich tradition of studies related to modality from before, and even more so after, modality was internationally recognized as a research topic in linguistics. This chapter will first relate the study of modality in traditional Japanese linguistics to the study of modality in general linguistics. The main part of this chapter will consist of an overview of modality in Japanese from a cross-linguistic perspective. This overview will cover modality in a broad sense, with brief reference to mood and illocutionary force. I will point out issues in the study of Japanese modality both in comparison to well-known European languages and with respect to the typological study of modality.

PART II: CONTRASTIVE STUDIES


Ainu, an endangered language in Japan, has long been spoken while receiving influence from Japanese. Although the two languages have apparent similarities in phonological systems, constituent order in affirmative sentences, and some analytic grammatical constructions on a deeper level, they are structurally very different, as indicated by such properties of Ainu as pronominal verbal marking, no case marking on arguments, mixed alignment, head-marking possessive construction, no tense marking, a great number of coded valency alternations including applicatives — all of which are foreign to Japanese. Focusing on the possessive constructions consisting of a head noun (possessee) and dependent noun (possessor) in a type of nominal attributive construction (‘N+N’), this chapter will clarify their syntactic, semantic, and functional differences between Ainu and Japanese. Syntactically, the possessive construction in Japanese is dependent-marking, where the possessor is marked with the genitive postposition –no, whereas its Ainu counterpart is head-marking, by which the possessee takes the so-called possessive form with possessive suffixes -hV or -V(hV) and is marked with one of the prefixes for the person and number of the possessor (3-rd person is zero), so pronominal (and even nominal) possessor NPs are commonly omitted. Semantically, Japanese does not make a formal distinction between inalienable and alienable possession, whereas in Ainu the possessive construction proper is used for inalienable possession only, with a different periphrastic construction employed for alienable possession. Functionally, the possessive construction in Japanese may encode any attributive relations with possessive attributive relations being just one possibility, while the Ainu construction is basically limited to possession proper; in the attributive construction, nouns are merely juxtaposed. This chapter will also discuss such descriptive and theoretical issues as the possessive form in Ainu and the emergence of POSS→
DEF grammaticalization of the possessive suffixes -hV or -V(hV) by extension of the associative anaphoric use (a bear … its body).

15. Property predication in Koryak and Japanese …… Megumi Kurebito (Toyama University)

As opposed to event (or stage-level) predications like Taro ga kesa koko ni kita. ‘Taro came here this morning’, which describe events or states that unfold as time progresses, property (or individual-level) predications like Taro wa kasikoi. ‘Taro is intelligent’ depict permanent and unchanging characteristics of a nominal entity. Most grammatical studies in the past have been concerned with the former type of predication, with only cursory attention paid to the latter. Drawing insights from the recent studies on this phenomenon in Japanese (Masuoka 1987 and Kageyama 2012), the present chapter demonstrates that Koryak, a Paleoasiatic language, has a special prefix n-, referred to as N-form, that is exclusively used to denote property predications (e.g. n tuqin ‘new, young’, n vetatqen ‘hardworking’, n muqeqin ‘rainy’). This characterization of this prefix captures its nature more accurately than its traditional term ‘qualitative adjective’ (Zhukova 1972). Specifically, it is observed that the N-form is derived not only from adjective stems but also from nominal, adverbal, and verbal stems, and that, as Kageyama (2009) points out with respect to a variety of syntactic and morphological phenomena of property predications in diverse languages, it undergoes decrease in transitivity by means of antipassivization, noun incorporation, and promotion of the oblique cases to the absolutive. Koryak thus lends support to the universal validity of the distinction between event and property predications not just as a semantic or pragmatic difference but as a syntactically and morphologically relevant notion.

16. ‘What’ and ‘who’ in Japanese and Chinese ………Hideki Kimura (University of Tokyo)

Many languages distinguish the interrogative pronouns denoting humans (dare in Japanese, who in English) from those denoting non-human entities (nan/nani in Japanese, what in English). Between these two types of interrogative pronouns the one used for humans is monosemous while the one for non-human entities is generally polysemous. No serious attention has been paid to this distinction in the grammatical studies on Japanese or any other languages. Although dare ‘who’ and nan/nani ‘what’ are grouped together under the rubric of ‘interrogative pronouns’, the usage of nan/nani such as concatenation with numerals as in nan-satu ‘how many (books)’ or with a noun as in nani-sinbun ‘which newspaper’ suggests that nan/nani is functionally different from dare. Like Japanese, Chinese also has the corresponding two types of interrogative pronouns. Shei ‘who’ is used exclusively for humans while shenme ‘what’ can be used not only for objects per se but also for interrogating the existence of various entities. This chapter will point out differences between Japanese and Chinese in the use of the non-human type of interrogative pronoun. For example, shenme cannot concatenate with numerals. A general rule will be proposed that dare is used for ‘identifying an individual’ while nan/nani is used for ‘stipulation of attribute or the fact/truth or state of affairs’. In answering a question Dare o matte imasu ka? ‘Who are you waiting for?’ it is infelicitous to say Hito/Sensei o matte imasu. ‘I am waiting for {a man / my teacher}’ while in answering a question Nani o matte imasu ka? ‘What are you waiting for?’ it is perfectly fine to say Hito/Takusii o matte imasu. ‘I am waiting for a {man/taxi}’. The polysemy of nan/nani can be straightforwardly explained by the semantic function of ‘stipulation of attribute or the fact/truth or state of affairs’. The reflection of this polysemy can be seen in its grammatical behaviour as well. Furthermore, comparison of Japanese and Chinese will bring to light various parameters such as ‘need for describing a property’, ‘need for entity specification’, ‘need for deictic specification’, and ‘need for binary choice specification’ that help to shed light on the similarities and differences between Japanese and Chinese interrogative pronouns.
17. Lexical transitivity pairs in Korean and Japanese...........Hiroko Maruyama (Hokkaido University)
Although Korean and Japanese show a striking resemblance in the domain of syntactical features, they differ considerably in the lexical transitive-intransitive alternations. This chapter focuses on the lexical domain of transitivity pairs (pairs of morphologically related transitive and intransitive verb) and shows that Japanese and Korean differ from each other in the following two respects. The first difference is the morphological coding of lexical transitive-intransitive pairs. In Japanese, it is easy to distinguish between transitive and intransitive verbs in morphological coding because transitivization (e.g. *her-u* 'decrease' → *her-as-u* 'cause to decrease') and detransitivization (e.g. *sas-u* 'to stick' → *sas-ar-u* 'be stuck') are coded by different suffixes although there is one exception where the same suffix *-e* serves for both transitivization (*ak-u* 'open (intr)’ → *ak-e-ru* ‘open (tr)’) and detransitivization (*ni-ru* 'to boil/stew' → *ni-e-ru* 'be boiled/cooked'). In Korean, on the other hand, the same set of suffixes, namely *-ihiilli/ki-*, is attached to either a transitive or intransitive stem as in *ssah-ta* 'pile up/load (tr.)' → *ssah-i-ta* 'accumulate/pile up (intr.)' and *cwuk-ta* 'to die (intr.)' → *cwuk-i-ta* 'to kill (tr.)'. Because of this this, it is not possible in Korean to distinguish transitive from intransitive verbs by merely looking at their suffixes, a situation reminiscent of the suffix *-e* in Japanese. The second difference is the relationship between the morphology used for lexical transitive-intransitive alternation and that used for grammatical voice (passive, causative) alternation. In Japanese, the passive *(r)are and causative *(s)ase can be clearly distinguished from the suffixes involved in the lexical transitive-intransitive alternations. In Korean, on the other hand, one and the same set of suffixes, *-ihiilli/ki-*, is employed for grammatical voice alternations as well as lexical transitive-intransitive alternations. Hence in Korean, it is not possible to distinguish transitive, intransitive, passive and causative verbs just by looking at the form of the verb. In Japanese, the division of labour between the lexical transitive-intransitive alternations and grammatical voice alternations has been discussed extensively. In contrast, the previous research on Korean has treated the derivation of transitive and intransitive verbs through *-ihiilli/ki-* suffixation as voice alternation (Ko and Nam 1985, Lee et al. 2004), and no serious analysis from the perspective of lexical transitivity alternations has been proposed. Furthermore, the suffixes *-ihiilli/ki-* involved in detransitivization and transitivization have been treated as different suffixes. The fact that the same set of suffixes *-ihiilli/ki-* involved in directionally opposite processes of detransitivization and transitivization must have some principled motivation behind it. This chapter argues that *-ihiilli/ki-* suffixes are flags to express a conceptually marked event with regard to the status of an agent.

18. Causative constructions in Japanese and Korean ............ Sung-yeo Chung (Osaka University)
There are two outstanding issues related to the causative constructions in Japanese and Korean. One is the correspondence between causative forms and their meanings, highlighted by the controversy between Shibatani (1973, 1975) and Yang (1972, 1974). The Korean lexical causative verbs may have the meaning of directive causation, which corresponds to the productive causative *(s)ase in Japanese, as in sensayngnim-i haksayngtul-ul chayksang wuy-ey se-ywu-ess-ta. [teacher-NOM students-ACC desk top-LOC stand-CAUS-PAST-DEC] ‘The teacher made the students stand on the desk (by order)’, where the verb *se-ywu-ess-ta* corresponds to *tat-ase-ru* [stand-CAUS-PRES] in Japanese. The same problem is found in Japanese as well. In Hahaoya ga kodomotai o nikai ni age-ta. [mother-NOM children-ACC second.floor-LOC raise-PAST] ‘The mother made the children go to the second floor (by order)’, the lexical causative verb *age-ta* refers to a directive causative situation. This example is difficult to map correctly onto the semantic map based on the causative continuum proposed by Shibatani and Chung (2002). The other issue has to do with Comrie’s (1981) generalization on causative affixation and valency changes. There are constructions that have semantically implied causees that are not syntactically encoded and yet express directive causative situations. They are called “mediative constructions”, as in Hideyosi ga Oosakazyoo o tate-ta [Hideyoshi
NOM Osaka-castle ACC build-PAST] ‘Hideyoshi built Osaka Castle’ (Japanese). These are a few of the cases that are difficult to explain in terms of the established theoretical devices. To solve these problems, this chapter will argue for a new model that includes the construal of nouns as well as verbs (Chung 2006). The new model deals with the semantics of noun phrases with respect to the relationship between the causer and the causee, which have often been thought of as a matter of pragmatics.

19. Deictic motion verbs in Lamaholot and Japanese … Naonori Nagaya (NINJAL)
Lamaholot, a Central Malayo-Polynesian language of the Austronesian language family, is spoken in the eastern tip of Flores Island and neighboring islands of the Republic of Indonesia (Nagaya 2011). Lamaholot and Japanese share some interesting features concerning deictic motion verbs. In particular, verbs of manner of motion, of path of motion, and of deictic motion have their own positions in this order, the noticeable structural difference being that Lamaholot deictic motion verbs form a serial verb construction, while Japanese counterparts constitute a converbal complex predicate (Shibatani 2007, 2009; Shibatani and Chung 2007). This chapter will address three questions of theoretical import surrounding deictic motion verbs and related phenomena in Lamaholot and Japanese; (i) any functional similarity between Lamaholot serial verb constructions and Japanese converbal complex predicates beyond the formal differences, (ii) the syntactic status of deictic motion verbs in the two languages, (iii) the head of the motion verb complexes, and (iv) similarities and differences of grammaticalization patterns of deictic motion verbs.

20. Topic constructions in Japanese and Tagalog …… Masumi Katagiri (Okayama University)
This chapter will discuss the behavior of ‘topic’ nominals in Tagalog in contrast with those in Japanese, and show how similar or different they are from the morphosyntactic and discourse-pragmatic perspectives. While it has been claimed that the topic in Philippine languages is grammaticalized into subject to a large extent at the morphosyntactic level (cf. Shibatani 1991), it will be shown that it still retains its status as a topic in many respects. For example, the choice of a topic is largely affected by its context, and is often actor-oriented at the discourse-pragmatic level, just like a prototypical topic in Japanese. It will be shown that the Tagalog actor-focus construction is not a derived intransitive, antipassive construction. This conclusion sheds light on the debate on the ergativity of Tagalog and other Philippine-type languages. There has long been a debate on the status of topics and the typological classification of Philippine-type languages, but most of the studies have focused only on those languages. When we discuss such controversial phenomena as topic, antipassive, or whatever, it is useful and often indispensable to compare them with the prototypical topic, antipassive, and other relevant constructions in other languages. Comparison of the Tagalog topic constructions with the prototypical topic constructions in Japanese will provide a new insight into some of the controversial issues in the field of typological studies of Philippine-type languages.

21. Complex case markers in Japanese and complex determiners in Kapampangan ……
Hiroaki Kitano (Aichi University of Education)
Besides monomorphemic case markers, Japanese has a number of complex case markers that have the following compositions; (i) monomorphemic ni/o/de/to + V-te form (e.g., ni oite, ni tuite, de motte) and (ii) no/to + formal noun + ni/de (e.g., no tame ni, no okage de, to tomo ni). This chapter first explores how the Japanese complex and monomorphemic case markers are distributed in naturally-occurring sentences, both spoken and written, by examining the Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese and the Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese (NINJAL). We will then move on to comparison of Japanese with Kapampangan, a Philippine language spoken in Central Luzon. Kapampangan is a head-initial language, employing determiners (prepositions) for case marking. Unlike Japanese, Kapampangan has only three monomorphemic determiners, i.e., ing (absolutive), ning (ergative), king (oblique), which are
forms for singular common nouns (different forms are used for plural nouns and for personal names). This means that the case relations not expressed by *ga, o* and *no* in Japanese may be expressed by *king* in Kapampangan. However, just like Japanese, Kapampangan has complex case markers such as *para king* ‘on behalf of’. In previous work, some phenomena have been pointed out that are common to both languages. First, some morphemes are fossilized and used only in certain complex case markers. Second, some complex case markers are limited to certain registers. Each case marker, be it monomorphemic or complex, has multiple functions and multiple dimensions of meaning, and how the form corresponds to the meaning differs between Japanese and Kapampangan. Although many morphosyntactic and semantic features are commonly observed in the case markers of both languages, some differences are also pointed out, such as ‘reduction’ of complex forms, which is often observed in spoken Kapampangan but is not common in Japanese. Additionally, closer examination of Japanese and Kapampangan case marking reveals typologically interesting features of Japanese case marking system.

22. Internal state predicates in Japanese and Thai ……… Satoshi Uehara (Tohoku University) and Kingkarn Thepkanjana (Chulalongkorn University)

This chapter examines the internal state predicates (ISPs) in Japanese, which are known for their characteristic person restriction (Kuroda 1975, Kuno 1975, inter alia), through comparison with those in Thai (Iwasaki 2002), a zero pronominal language in South-east Asia. Based on the fact that Thai also has expressions involving ISPs (i.e. the *can* construction) that exhibit a person restriction, it will be demonstrated that (i) the restriction in Thai is characterized as constructional and is marked while the restriction in Japanese is lexical and unmarked; (ii) the use of some sensation predicates (e.g. *çèp* ‘hurt’) in Thai presupposes the existence of the interlocutor/hearer, i.e. they can be used only in the descriptive mode, while their semantic equivalents (e.g. *itai*) in Japanese can be used in a soliloquy, i.e. in the exclamatory mode; (iii) both languages allow the experiencer NP of ISPs to be zero, but that unlike those in Thai, ISPs in Japanese are characterized as ‘deictic predicates’ (Uehara 2011, Langacker 1985), whose conceptualizer role is assumed to be the speaker and is by default structurally implicit as the reference point; and (iv) deictic predicates with such a person restriction in Japanese range widely over all ISPs of the language, from state predicates of emotion and sensation to those of desire and thought processes. These differences in the lexicalization pattern of ISPs suggest that the omission or absence of the experiencer in the two languages is motivated by different factors, with Japanese representing the ‘deictic zero’ subtype of zero pronouns. Furthermore, the Japanese lexicalization pattern of ISPs, together with those of deictic motion and social deixis (honorifics), indicates that Japanese leans toward conventionalizing and grammaticalizing into the unmarked pattern the speaker’s subjective construal/conceptualization of events with the speaker as the default reference point.

23. Verb complexes in Japanese and Thai ……… Makoto Minegishi (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies)

This chapter aims to analyze the verb complexes in Japanese and Thai. Not much work has been done in this area since Japanese, an agglutinative language with the SOV order, seems too far away from Thai, an isolating language with the SVO order. A verbal construction in Japanese consists of one lexical verb with optional post-verbs, followed by aspect and modality markers and/or auxiliary suffixes, some of which are grammaticalized from nominals. Converbs can be added to form an extended predicate complex, or a subordinate clause, although no clear-cut distinction can be made between a predicate complex and a subordinate clause in an agglutinative language like Japanese. A basic verb predicate in Thai, on the other hand, may be a main verb without any marker of aspect or modality. Such a verb may be preceded by a series of preverbal modal markers and/or followed by postverbal aspect and/or modal markers. A verbal complex can be made by combining lexical verbs in serial verb constructions. By comparing elements forming verbal constructions with regard to semantic properties of verbs,
this chapter will clarify to what extent converb structure and serial verb construction are similar
to each other.

24. Deictic motion verbs in Japanese and Thai ………… Kiyoko Takahashi (Kanda
University of International Studies)
Deictic motion verbs (‘go’ and ‘come’) in Japanese and Thai are commonly multifunctional. They basically denote a spatial relation between the ‘deictic center’ (the speaker’s point of reference) and an entity moving in relation to it, or more specifically, they indicate an entity’s motion away from or toward it. They also express a more abstract deictic relation between two focal elements in temporal, textual or cognitive domains. This chapter aims to thoroughly analyze similarities and differences in the use of deictic motion verbs between the two languages. In particular, it will discuss their remarkable differences in the following three respects: (i) the formation of complex predicates containing a deictic motion verb, (ii) the degree of semantic versatility of deictic motion verbs, and (iii) the way of anchoring a deictic motion expression to the deictic center.

25. Non-entailment of event realizations in Burmese and Japanese …….. Atsuhiko Kato
(Osaka University)
Japanese often exhibits a phenomenon called ‘cancellation of result entailment’, as in Mado o
aketa keredo, akanakatta. lit ‘I opened the window, but it didn’t open,’ in which the
achievement of a resultant state (e.g. the door being open) that is normally entailed by a
causative change-of-state verb (e.g. tr. akeru ‘to open’) is explicitly denied. This chapter focuses on the cancellation of result entailment in Burmese, which is always permissible with all causative change-of-state verbs. The verbs in Burmese can be grouped into volitional and non-volitional verbs. Even if a volitional verb contains a result in its logical structure, it does not semantically imply realization of the result. Therefore, in Burmese, sentence (1) is totally acceptable:

(1) phwë=bëmɛ ma-pwë=bù
open(tr.)=although NEG-open(intr.)=VSM
lit. ‘(I) opened (the window), but (it) didn’t open.’
Intended meaning ‘(I) tried to open (the window), but (it) didn’t open.’

Even more noteworthy is that Burmese volitional verbs of action do not imply that the action has been performed. Sentence (2) is totally acceptable:

(2) khò= bèmɛ ma-khò=hnain=bù
jump=although NEG-jump=can=VSM (VSM: verb sentence marker)
lit. ‘(I) jumped, but (I) couldn’t jump.’
Intended meaning ‘(I) tried to jump, but (I) couldn’t jump.’

Comparison of Japanese and Burmese brings to light the semantic peculiarity of Burmese verbs, and it will be suggested that this peculiarity is an areal feature common to Southeast Asian languages including Chinese and Thai.

26. The progressive/resultative polysemy in Japanese and two Tibeto-Burman languages,
Newar and Meche ………………. Kazuyuki Kiryu (Mimasaka University)
This chapter discusses the aspectual function of the Japanese auxiliary verb te iru, contrasting it with its counterparts in two Tibeto-Burman languages, Newar and Meche. The semantics of the te iru has been analyzed as continuous (progressive/resultative) (Kindaichi 1950) and as imperfective (Shirai 1998), and its various extended functions such as perfect and continuation of effect have also been discussed (Kudo 1995). This issue is important in the study of aspect from typological perspectives. Both Newar and Meche have an auxiliary verb that originates from existential verbs cwane and dəŋ, and both of them can express progressive and resultative. However the ranges of extended functions of the auxiliary verbs are different from that of the te iru in Japanese: cwane does not express perfect or simple state, and dəŋ covers most of the
perfect sense (resultative, experiential, current relevance) but not habitual and simple state. The similarities and differences among the three languages suggest that the aspectual distinction between perfective and imperfective might be not universally valid; it would be more feasible to assume the eventive/stative distinction as a basic notion common to the three languages. The chapter will argue that the primary function of the *te iru* and the two auxiliary verbs in Newar and Meche is stativization, and that the progressive/resultative senses and other extended functions such as habitual and perfect are naturally derived from this fundamental meaning through the aktionsart of an individual verb.

27. **Verb+Verb compounding in Japanese and Turkish ……… Yu Kuribayashi (Okayama University)**

Japanese Verb + Verb compounding is a very productive word formation process. At first sight, typological properties such as OV syntax and agglutinating morphology appear to be factors that determine the abundance of V+V compounds. However, if we look at Altaic languages including Turkish, this view is thrown in doubt. Specifically, the variety of V+V compound verbs in Turkish is highly limited and can be found only in a few aspectual expressions. In this chapter, after reviewing word formation processes of Turkish, I will focus on the analysis of V+V compounding and show that the qualia structure and morphophonological properties of nominal compounding in Turkish play an important role in explaining the differences of Japanese and Turkish compound verbs.

28. **Dative and its related notions in Japanese and French ……… Hiroshi Hayashi (Kobe University)**

Because of its abundant semantic and syntactic variations, the dative case has attracted the attention of many linguists. In Japanese the dative case is marked by the particle *ni* and in French by the preposition *à*. This chapter provides a comprehensive description of the dative marker *ni* in comparison with *à*. The discussion consists of the following four parts.

1. Representation of the overall meanings of *ni* and *à* on the conceptual space: A representation in the form of a ‘semantic map’ is proposed.

2. Semantic analysis of *ni*: A semantic analysis is offered taking into consideration the syntactic properties of *ni*.

3. ‘Polysemist’ approach: Unlike the ‘monosemist’ approach (Haspelmath, 2003), a ‘polysemist’ approach is advocated in which *ni* is analyzed into three basic meanings, all of which share the notion of ‘contact’ as a common semantic denominator.

4. Semantic contrast between dative and accusative cases in Japanese and French: A notion of ‘saliency in an event’ is proposed to account for the opposition between *à*-causative and *par*-causative in French and the opposition between *o*-causative and *ni*-causative in Japanese.

29. **The dative subject construction in Japanese and Romanian ……… Daniela Caluianu (Otaru University of Commerce)**

This chapter examines the Dative Subject Constructions (DSC) in Japanese and Romanian. Although an initial analysis suggests that the DSCs in the two languages are very similar, covering roughly the same semantic domains, a reassessment of the semantic properties of the construction through a comparison with alternating constructions reveals important distinctions. Although the dative subject is typically associated in both Japanese and Romanian with the semantic role ‘experiencer’, the type of experiencer involved is different in the two languages. In Japanese, the dative experiencer is an evaluator, whereas in Romanian it is the experiencer of unanalyzed sensations. In this sense, the Romanian DSC is semantically closer to the Japanese double nominative construction. The differences between the two languages could be attributed to the properties of the respective case markers. In Japanese the dative case is marked with the locative particle *-ni*. The dative experiencer is a standard of evaluation or a location where the impact of the stimulus is measured. In Romanian, the dative is syncratic with the genitive, a fact
that could explain why the relation between the experiencer and the stimulus is more intimate, like the part-whole relation.

30. Modality in Japanese and Spanish ................. Noritaka Fukushima (Kobe City University of Foreign Studies)
The recent years have seen a great surge in comparative studies between Spanish and Japanese, especially in the domain of modality. While there are many studies that make use of the insights of studies on the modality in Japanese to analyze the modality in Spanish, there are few that make use of the insights of studies on modality in Spanish to discover hitherto ignored phenomena in Japanese. Two noteworthy exceptions are Honda (1985) and Wasa (2005). Honda argues that the overt distinction between realis/irrealis mood in Spanish brings to light the covert context-sensitive distinction between realis/irrealis mood in Japanese. Wasa (2005) shows that the subjunctive mood in Spanish can be interpreted as modality of suspending truth-value judgment and that this modality can be traced in the "irrealis-form+mu" in Old Japanese. Building on the observation that the irrealis mood in Spanish also has a realis mood usage, this chapter argues that this fact offers a crucial insight in analyzing modality of the content clause in Japanese. Specifically, in the subordinate clause headed by the phrase el hecho de que 'the fact that', even though the contents expressed by the clause are true, they take subjunctive mood terminations if the amount of information is insufficient. This insight from Spanish is useful in distinguishing koto-caluses from to iu koto-clauses in Japanese.

31. Strategies for the Expansion of Argument Structure: A Japanese-German Contrast .............. Akio Ogawa (Kwansei Gakuin University)
This chapter focuses on the following two phenomena especially characteristic for German. First, the dative constructions in German have a variety of uses corresponding to the datives in other European languages (dative object, and so-called “free” datives: dative of pertinence, dative commode, dative incommodi, ethical dative). It is argued that the realization of a dative nominal depends on a set of (partly universal) conditions placed on the expansion of argument structure. The corresponding Japanese constructions with the dative ni, especially the multiple subject constructions and adversative passive, will be compared in this respect (Kare wa atama ga itai. ‘He has a headache.’ vs. Ihm tut der Kopf weh. and Kare wa okusan ni nigerareta. ‘His wife ran away on him.’ vs. Ihm ist seine Frau davon gelaufen). Second, the genitive object constructions, though fossilized in German, are also related to the dative constructions, as long as they co-occur with accusative cases, and serve to widen the argument structure to ditransitivity. While the accusative object is subcategorized for obligatorily, the genitive object is not, which indicates the obliqueness of the genitive object on the one hand and its similarity to the dative object on the other. The chapter shows that the obliqueness stems from the diachronic development of the genitive object whereas the similarity to the dative nominal is spurious (i.e. both are based on different syntactic and semantic structures). Japanese exhibits a similar phenomenon in the use of the formal noun koto, as in Hans ga Peter o, okane o nusunda-koto-de togameta. ‘Hans blamed Peter for stealing the money’ for Hans bezichtigte Peter des Diebstahls. Comparison of these two related but competitive constructions in German with their Japanese counterparts reveals important typological characteristics of both languages.

32. Quantifier float in Japanese and English ...... Ken’ichi Takami (Gakushuin University)
This chapter discusses quantifier float in Japanese, comparing it with its English counterpart. It has long been noted that while in English only universal quantifiers like all and each can float (e.g. The students will all come to the party.), in Japanese not only universal but also existential and even numeral quantifiers can float (e.g. Gakusei-ga konban sune-nin/san-nin paattii-ni kuru. ‘Some/Three students will come to the party tonight.’). This chapter attempts to make a functional explanation of this disparity. While research in generative grammar holds that a floating (numeral) quantifier and its associated NP in Japanese must observe strict locality (be adjacent to each other) at some stage of derivation (e.g., Kuroda 1980, Haig 1980, Miyagawa
1989, Miyagawa and Arikawa 2007), I will present counterexamples to that assumption and argue that the positions of floating quantifiers are controlled by the functional principle of ‘From-Old-to-New’ (Takami and Kuno 2002, Kuno and Takami 2003). The positions of English floating quantifiers, too, are shown to follow from this principle of information structure, coupled with another functional constraint called ‘Predication Relation.’ The chapter will also discuss what type of NP — (in)definite NP, subject NP, object NP, oblique NP — allows quantifier float in Japanese and English and why quantifier float is disallowed with other types of NPs.

33. A cognitive perspective on marked subject realizations in English and Japanese ………
Yoshiki Nishimura (University of Tokyo)
Couched in the framework of Langacker’s cognitive grammar, where grammar (syntax in particular) is characterized as a system composed entirely of form-meaning pairings (rather than a purely formal component organized independently of semantic factors), this chapter provides cognitive accounts of two areas of grammar where English and Japanese exhibit marked contrasts. The first case has to do with verbs of perception. The tendency of the Japanese verbs of perception to leave the perceiver unexpressed (and, concomitantly, to confer subject status on what is perceived) is accounted for in terms of the greater degree of ‘subjectivity’ with which these verbs construe the perceiver, whereas their English counterparts treat the perceiver just as ‘objectively’ as the entity perceived. In other words, English tends to present a perceptual experience as an asymmetrical relation holding between two ‘onstage’ participants, treating the subject and the object of perception analogously to the agent and the patient of a prototypical transitive action, whereas Japanese tends to place the perceiver ‘offstage’, casting the perceived object as an entity coming into or existing in his/her field of perception. The second case pertains to causative constructions. Specifically, English easily allows inanimate entities to appear as causative subjects (e.g. An explosion woke me up in the middle of the night.), which is not usually possible in Japanese. On the other hand, Japanese can apply causative expressions to situations which could just as easily be represented by passive constructions (e.g. a mother can be coded as causative subject to talk about the death of her son in an accident she could not possibly have prevented) — an illegitimate use of causatives in English. These and other cross-linguistic differences are shown to be semantically motivated in the sense that they reflect the distinct but equally natural ways in which the two languages conventionally extend a shared prototype of agentive causation to encompass their respective spectra of causative constructions.

34. Noun-modifying constructions in Swahili and Japanese ……………. Nobuko Yoneda
( Osaka University)
This chapter provides a comprehensive description of the noun-modifying constructions in Swahili, contrasting them with their functional equivalents in Japanese. Two types of noun-modifying constructions are distinguished in Swahili: one marked with the overt complementizer *amba*- (called ‘*amba* relative’) and the other without it (‘*amba*-less relative’). There are some well-known restrictions that apply only to *amba*-less relatives. First, tense markers that can be used in the modifying clause are limited, and second, the verb must be placed immediately after the head noun. It has been generally accepted that these restrictions are the major characteristics of *amba*-less relatives which essentially distinguish them from *amba* relatives. While this is basically correct, there is another important difference between the two constructions, that is, the relation between the head noun and the modifying clause. The binary classification of “internal relation” and “external relations” in Japanese linguistics (Teramura 1975) appears to apply to the noun-modifying constructions in Swahili. The *amba*-less relatives can mainly modify the head nouns that hold “internal relations” with the modifying clause (there is a case relation between the head noun and the modifying clause). In contrast, the *amba* relatives can modify not only the head nouns that have “internal relation”, but also those in “external relation” with the modifying clause (there is no case relation between the head noun and the modifying clause). Previous studies of Swahili have looked into only the constructions
in which the head noun holds an internal relation to the noun-modifying clause, whereby external relations have been ignored. Although both types of noun-modifying constructions are called “relative clauses” in Swahili linguistics, only the *amba*-less relatives count as a genuine relative clause, and the *amba* relatives have a wide usage in the same way that the Japanese noun-modifying clauses do. Comparison with Japanese in this chapter thus makes a significant contribution to Swahili linguistics.

35. Event Integration Patterns in Japanese and Sidaama ...............Kazuhiro Kawachi (National Defense Academy of Japan)
According to Talmy’s typology of event integration (1991, 2000), verb-framed languages typically encode the most core-schematic components of certain types of events in the main verb, and express event components supporting these components in an adverbial subordinate clause or a non-main verb, whereas satellite-framed languages characteristically use a satellite to express the most core-schematic event components, and encode the supporting event components in the verb root. Talmy argues that this contrast is found in the event domains of motion, state change, realization, temporal contouring, and action correlation. This chapter examines how Talmy’s hypothesis on this typology applies to Japanese and Sidaama, a Cushitic language of Ethiopia. It shows that although these languages exhibit the clear pattern of verb-framed languages in the event domains of motion, state change, and realization, they similarly deviate from this pattern in their expressions of some types of temporal contouring and of most types of action correlation. Thus, these languages are different from prototypical verb-framed languages that consistently show their characteristic pattern across all the five different event domains, and may possibly form the same typological type as far as event integration is concerned.

36. Head marking in Mayan and dependent marking in Japanese ........ Yoshiho Yasugi (National Museum of Ethnology)
Japanese is a dependent-marking accusative language with an SOV word order, while the Mayan languages are head-marking ergative languages with a VOS word order. They totally exhibit mirror-image patterns. Furthermore, Japanese verbs basically have abstract meanings, with concrete meanings supplemented by adverbs. On the other hand, each verb in the Mayan languages is concrete, and adverbial meanings are attached to it by means of a suffix. Studies on ergativity have been pursued since 1970’s, but the importance of the difference of intransitive subject and transitive subject (or agent) is not recognized well. This is related to antipassive. There are three kinds of antipassive: absolutive antipassive, agent focus antipassive and incorporating antipassive. Agent focus is used when the agent is fronted, while absolutive antipassive demotes the object. These are different functionally but are often confused. Although most grammars are written in terms of dependent-marking, the phenomenon in which an adverbial function is marked on the verb instead of the nominal phrase can be understood only in terms of head-marking. Recently, however, the head-marking in the Mayan languages has been changing into dependent-marking. This is due to the change of word order from VOS to SVO. This chapter will present new perspectives on Japanese from the vantage point of head-marking languages, and point out the importance of a head-marking grammar.