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1. Introduction. Verbal nouns have been the focus of much research since Grimshaw and Mester (1988) because of their special properties bearing on theta theory and Case theory. This paper will discuss the syntactic structure of a verbal noun construction in example 1, shedding more light upon those properties.¹

(1) Yamada-san ga tyuukosya o HANBAI no ori (ni)
    Yamada-Mr. NOM used cars ACC sale  ? occasion (on)
    ‘(on) the occasion when Mr. Yamada sells used cars’

I refer to nominative and accusative Cases as clausal Case, and ga and o as clausal Case markers. HANBAI in 1 is a verbal noun or VN, and I highlight VNs in capital letters. As the name implies, VNs possess both verbal and nominal characteristics, and I will illustrate their dual character shortly. Theta-theoretically, HANBAI is the main predicate, taking two arguments Yamada-san and tyuukosya. I put a question mark in the gloss for no, because its categorial status is controversial. Example 1 is an NP, witness the fact that it can take the postposition ni. The example, therefore, raises this question: What licenses clausal Case markers ga and o in 1, although it is an NP in terms of its distribution?

To answer this question, one needs to account for the dual character of VNs, which is illustrated in 2.

(2) a. Yamada-san no tyuukosya no HANBAI
    Yamada-Mr. GEN used cars GEN sale
    ‘Mr. Yamada’s sale of used cars’

    b. Yamada-san ga tyuukosya o HANBAI-suru
    Yamada-Mr. NOM used cars ACC sale-do
    ‘Mr. Yamada sells used cars.’

In 2a, HANBAI is the head of an NP, taking two genitive-marked NP modifiers. It, then, behaves just like a regular noun. In 2b, HANBAI-suru is a complex predicate, and takes two NP arguments marked by clausal Case. HANBAI behaves like a verb in that it cooccurs with, and theta-marks, nominative and accusative NPs. VNs, thus, have both nominal and verbal characteristics.

I will argue in this paper that the dual character of VNs follows from the hypothesis that they do not always project as an NP. HANBAI projects in 2a, but does not in 2b. When they project as an NP, VNs behave just like a regular noun, exhibiting nominal characteristics. When they do not, they form a complex predicate and exhibit verbal characteristics. Specifically, I will argue that HANBAI in 1 does not project but forms a complex predicate with the copula no. Thus, example 1 has the structure shown in 3.

(3) [NP [IP Yamada-san ga tyuukosya o [HANBAI no]] [NP ori]]

Example 1 is analyzed as an NP whose head noun ori is modified by a relative clause with a complex predicate HANBAI no. This analysis explains the external
distribution of 1. As for clausal Case, the complex predicate assigns accusative Case to tuuukosya; and Infl of the relative clause, nominative Case to Yamada-san.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews previous analyses of 1. Section 3 shows that some occurrences of no are the nonfinite copula. In section 4, I will argue that no in 1 is also the nonfinite copula, and present my analysis of 1. Section 5 summarizes the main arguments of this paper.

2. Review of previous analyses. Faced with the dual character of VNs, previous attempts have either treated them as an N, attributing their verbal characteristics to their interaction with some verbal or functional element in their vicinity, or treated them as an underspecified category compatible with behaving as an N or a V. This section critically reviews Miyagawa (1991), Sato (1993), and Manning (1993).

2.1. Miyagawa (1991). Miyagawa (1991:6-19) claims that ori in 1 has an aspectual meaning, and that it is an Aspectual functional category ASP. ASP licenses clausal Case, and takes as its complement an NP whose head is a VN. The derivation of 1 under Miyagawa’s account is given in 4.

(4) \([\text{ASP} \text{ Yamada-san}_i \text{ ga } [\text{ASP} \text{ t}_i \text{ tuuukosya o t}_j ] [\text{ASP} \text{ HANBAI}_j \text{ no } \text{ ori}]]\)

In 4, HANBAI projects as an NP, and incorporates into ASP in order to assign accusative Case to tuuukosya. Yamada-san moves to the Spec of ASP phrase, where it is marked nominative. The verbal noun construction in 1, then, is an ASP phrase or a clause.

Miyagawa’s analysis has two problems. First, contrary to his claim, aspectual nouns are irrelevant to the licensing of clausal Case, as shown in 5.

(5) Yamada-san ga tuuukosya o HANBAI no mise
    Yamada-Mr. NOM used cars ACC sale . shop
    ‘the shop where Mr. Yamada sells used cars’

5 differs minimally from 1 in having mise instead of an aspectual noun ori. Nevertheless, clausal Case is licensed in this example as well. The presence of ori in 1, therefore, is irrelevant to the licensing of clausal Case. The second problem concerns the external distribution of 1. As Manning (1993) points out, Miyagawa’s analysis wrongly predicts that 1 has the same distribution as a clause, but in fact its external syntax is exactly that of an NP.

2.2. Sato (1993). Sato (1993:124-189) bases his analysis of 1 on the parallelism between 1 and 2b. He takes VNs as an N and argues that in 2b the light verb suru is responsible for the verbal characteristics of HANBAI. Analogously, he posits a zero light verb in 1 and argues that it is responsible for the verbal characteristics of HANBAI. 6 shows his analysis of 1.

(6) \([\text{NP} [\text{CP} [\text{IP} \text{ Yamada-san ga } [\text{VP} \text{ tuuukosya o } [\text{V} \text{ HANBAI } [\text{v zero light verb}]]]] \text{ no} ] [\text{N} \text{ ori}]]\)

In 6, the temporal word ori takes a CP complement and licenses the occurrence of the zero light verb inside the CP. HANBAI and the zero light verb form a complex
predicate. Nominative Case is assigned by Infl associated with the zero light verb, and accusative Case is assigned by the complex predicate.

Sato’s analysis has two problems. First, as I have shown in 5, nouns with no temporal meaning can occur in place of ori. This raises the questions of what licenses the zero light verb in 5 and 6, and whether or not its occurrence can be sufficiently constrained at all. Second, Sato analyzes HANBAI in 1 as projecting as an NP. His analysis, then, predicts that noun modifiers which normally occur in an NP headed by HANBAI can also occur in 1. This prediction, however, turns out to be false, as shown in 7.

(7) a. [NP seiryokutekina HANBAI]
   aggressive sale
   ‘aggressive sale’

b. *Yamada-san ga tyuukosya o seiryokutekina HANBAI no ori
   aggressive

7 shows that the noun modifier seiryokutekina, which normally occurs in an NP headed by HANBAI, cannot occur in 1. Sato (1993:77) explains the unacceptability of 7b by proposing a generalization that a modified VN such as seiryokutekina HANBAI in 7b cannot project an argument structure. However, a question still remains as to why that is the case.

2.3. Manning (1993). Manning (1993) proposes the concept of categorial underspecification, and argues that VNs are an underspecified category which is compatible with behaving as either a verb or a noun. His analysis of VNs as an underspecified category can best be illustrated with examples like 8.

(8) Yamada-san ga tyuukosya no HANBAI no ori
    Yamada-Mr. NOM used cars GEN sale GEN occasion
    ‘the occasion when Mr. Yamada was engaged in the sale of used cars’

Manning takes the no following HANBAI in 8 as the genitive Case marker. He argues that the nominative-marked argument Yamada-san ga specifies that its sister is a verbal projection, while the genitive-marked argument tyuukosya no selects for a nominal sister. He concludes from this that HANBAI is an underspecified category so that it may meet these two contradictory requirements.

However, resorting to the concept of an underspecified category is conceptually undesirable because it makes the theory of grammar less restrictive. Moreover, examples like 9 pose an empirical problem to Manning’s analysis of 8.

(9) Yamada-san ga Berkeley no gakusei no toki
    Yamada-Mr. NOM Berkeley GEN student ? time
    ‘the time when Mr. Yamada was a student at Berkeley’

9 is similar to 8 in having a nominative-marked NP Yamada-san ga and a genitive-marked NP Berkeley no. But it differs from 8 in that it does not contain a VN but a regular noun gakusei. If we follow Manning’s reasoning, we are forced to treat regular nouns like gakusei as an underspecified category. However, regular nouns differ crucially from VNs in always projecting as an NP and in failing to occur in the sentence pattern 2b. Therefore, regular nouns cannot be treated as an
underspecified category. From this it follows that nominative Case in 9 is licensed independently of *gakusei. This, in turn, raises a question about Manning’s analysis of 8. What licenses nominative Case in 8? Whatever it may be, the licenser of nominative Case in 9 may well be the licenser in 8 as well, and consequently the VN in 8 may not be underspecified.

3. Nominative *ga and the copula *no in Japanese. The category of *no in examples like 1 has been controversial. In this section, I will demonstrate that some occurrences of *no are the nonfinite attributive form of the copula, and in the next section I will argue that *no in 1 is also the nonfinite copula.

There is no agreement about how many types of *no should be recognized, but for the purpose of the present discussion I confine myself to only two types of *no, which are illustrated in 10.

(10) isya *no musume (Sells 1996b)
   doctor COP/GEN daughter
   (i) ‘my daughter who is a doctor’ (copular use)
   (ii) ‘the doctor’s daughter’ (genitive use)

10 is ambiguous with two readings. In the first reading (i), *no functions like the copula, while in the second reading (ii) it functions like a genitive marker. Sells (1996b) refers to *no here as the default linker, claiming that *no is a single morpheme with various uses, including the copular use and the genitive use. However, I will claim, following Okutsu (1981:113-197), that the copula *no and the genitive Case marker *no are distinct morphemes.

I will present three arguments for recognizing the copula *no as a morpheme distinct from the genitive Case marker. The first argument concerns the distribution and interpretation of *no. Its distribution and interpretation correspond exactly to those of the present- and past-tense attributive forms of the copula. First, consider 11.

(11) a. Taro ga imamonao dokusin da/de aru/*no
    Taro NOM still bachelor COP-PRE/COP-PRE/?
    ‘Taro is still a bachelor.’

b. Taro ga imamonao dokusin *da/de aru/no riyuu wa
    Taro NOM still bachelor COP-PRE/COP-PRE/? reason TOP
    teisyoku ga nai kara desu
    steady job NOM not have because COP-PRE
    ‘The reason Taro is still a bachelor is that he does not have a steady job.’

In 11, *da is the copula, and I take *de aru as a periphrastic form of the copula. In 11a, *da and *de aru are called a conclusive form (i.e. a form used in matrix clauses). 11b contains 11a as a relative clause. *De aru here is called an attributive form (i.e. a form used in relative clauses and noun complement constructions). In 11b, *no can replace the attributive form *de aru without any change in meaning. Note that *da can occur only in 11a, while *no can occur only in 11b. 11 seems to suggest that *no is the attributive form of *da, because *da and *no are complementary in distribution. However, this is not the case, as 12 shows.
(12) a. Taro ga sakunen made dokusin datta/de atta/*no
   Taro NOM last year till bachelor COP-PAST/COP-PAST/?
   ‘Taro had been a bachelor till last year.’

b. Taro ga sakunen made dokusin datta/de atta/no riyuu wa
   Taro NOM last year till bachelor COP-PAST/COP-PAST/? reason TOP
teisyoku ga nakatta kara desu
steady job NOM not had because COP-PRE
   ‘The reason Taro had been a bachelor till last year is that he did not
   have a steady job.’

In 12a, both datta and de atta can be used, while no cannot. 12b contains 12a as a
relative clause. The copulas datta and de atta are a conclusive form in 12a and an
attributive form in 12b. In 12b, no can replace the past-tense attributive forms of
the copula datta and de atta. 11 and 12, then, show that no shares its distribution
and interpretation with the present- and past-tense attributive form of the copula.

The second argument for the copula no is based on the cooccurrence of no with
the nominative Case marker. Consider 11b and 12b again. Dokusin is a regular
noun, and Taro is marked nominative. What assigns or licenses nominative Case
here? Assuming the GB theory, we can take its assigner to be the Infl associated
with the finite copula. However, nominative Case is still assigned when no replaces
the copula. This fact is explained if no is a verbal element and is associated with
Infl. But the fact is unexplained, if no is the genitive Case marker or the default
linker. This argument, coupled with the first argument, leads us to conclude that no
in 11b and 12b is the nonfinite attributive form of the copula.

The third and final argument for the copula no comes from the fact that the
copula na shares the two properties of no discussed above. First, consider 13.

(13) a. ryooisin ga imamo kenzai da/de aru/*na
   parents NOM still good health COP-PRE/COP-PRE/COP
   ‘My parents are still alive and well.’

b. ryooisin ga imamo kenzai *da/de aru/na gakusei
   parents NOM still good health COP-PRE/COP-PRE/COP student
   ‘students whose parents are still alive and well’

In 13, kenzai is an adjectival noun (AN) or a noun with an adjectival meaning. In
13a, da and de aru, which are conclusive forms, can occur, but na cannot. 13a is
embedded in 13b as a relative clause. In 13b, de aru and na, which are attributive
forms, can occur, but da cannot. The copula na is an attributive form and takes
ANs. This explains why na is unacceptable in 13a, but acceptable in 13b. 13b shows
that the copula na shares its distribution and interpretation with the present-
tense attributive form of the copula. However, this does not mean that na is the

(14) a. ryooisin ga sono toozi mada kenzai datta/de atta/*na
   parents NOM that time still good health COP-PAST/COP-PAST/COP
   ‘My parents were still alive and well at that time.’
b. ryooisin ga sono toozi mada kenzai datta/de atta/na parents NOM that time still good health COP-PAST/COP-PAST/COP gakusei student
‘students whose parents were still alive and well at that time’

In 14a, conclusive forms datta and de atta can occur, but na cannot. 14b contains
14a as a relative clause. In 14b, na can replace the past-tense copula datta and de
atta. 13 and 14, then, show that just like no, the copula na shares its distribution
and interpretation with the present- and past-tense attributive forms of the copula.

Moreover, nominative Case in 13b and 14b is licensed, even when na replaces
the finite copula. This fact is explained by assuming that the Infl associated with
na licenses nominative Case. Na and no, therefore, share another property, namely
being associated with Infl.

I conclude from these three arguments that no and na are allomorphs, and that
they are the nonfinite attributive forms of the copula.

(15) Finite and Nonfinite Forms of the Copula in Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Finite Form</th>
<th>Nonfinite Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusive Form</td>
<td>PRE : da (de aru)</td>
<td>NN: *no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAST: datta (de atta)</td>
<td>AN: *na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributive Form</td>
<td>PRE : *da (de aru)</td>
<td>NN: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAST: datta (de atta)</td>
<td>AN: na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 15, da is exceptional among the finite forms in that it lacks an attributive form.
The nonfinite form cannot be used as a conclusive form, because a conclusive form
is by definition finite. In Japanese, no verb except the copula has nonfinite
attributive forms corresponding to no or na. In this section, I have demonstrated
that some occurrences of no are the nonfinite attributive forms of the copula.

4. Analysis of the verbal noun construction. In this section, I will first argue,
following Yoshida (1986:102-106) and Matsumoto (1992:118), that no in example
1 is also the copula and then discuss how clausal Case is licensed in 1. Finally, I
will propose my analysis of 1 and present some arguments for it.

4.1. Nominative ga and the copula no in the verbal noun construction. Two facts
indicate that no in example 1 is the copula. First, example 1, repeated below, is
actually ambiguous with two readings given in 16.

(1) Yamada-san ga tyuukosya o HANBAI no ori (ni)
Yamada-Mr. NOM used cars ACC sale ? occasion (on)
‘(on) the occasion when Mr.Yamada sells used cars’
(16) a. (on) the occasion when Mr. Yamada sells used cars
b. (on) the occasion when Mr. Yamada sold used cars
The two readings in 16 differ only in the tense interpretation of HANBAI no. This suggests that no in 1 is independent of tense distinction, just as the copula no. Second, in 1 no cooccurs with a nominative-marked NP, just as in the case of the copula no. On the basis of these two facts, I claim that no in 1 is also the nonfinite copula, and that the Infl associated with no licenses nominative Case in 1, just as in 11b and 12b.

One potential problem with this analysis of no is that no in 1 cannot be replaced by the finite copula but by suru ‘do’ or sita ‘did’, as shown in 17.

(17) a. Yamada-san ga tyyukosya o HANBAI no/de aru/*datta ori
    COP/COP-PRE/COP-PAST

    b. Yamada-san ga tyyukosya o HANBAI no/suru/sita ori
    COP/do/did

In 17a, neither the present-tense nor the past-tense copula can replace no. Instead, as 17b shows, suru and sita can replace no. In fact, the finite copula cannot take VNs, with the exception of a few examples like 18.

(18) Sells (1996b)
    bokutati wa asita Tokyo e SYUPPATU da!
    we TOP tomorrow Tokyo to departure COP
    ‘Tomorrow we leave for Tokyo.’

In 18, the finite copula da takes the VN SYUPPATU. Now, I propose to solve the potential problem by arguing that finite and nonfinite copulas differ in their subcategorization properties. The finite copula takes NNS and ANs, while suru takes VNs. However, this pattern does not apply in the case of the nonfinite attributive forms, because suru lacks such a form. Therefore, the nonfinite attributive form of the copula takes all three types of nouns, as shown in 19.

(19) Subcategorization Properties of the Copula in Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finite Form</th>
<th>Nonfinite Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Conclusive &amp; Attributive Forms)</td>
<td>(Attributive Form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copula [NN ___]</td>
<td>copula (no) [NN ___]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copula [AN ___]</td>
<td>copula (na) [AN ___]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(saru [VN ___])</td>
<td>copula (no) [VN ___]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 shows that the finite form of the copula subcategorizes for NNS and ANs, while suru subcategorizes for VNs. The situation is different when the nonfinite form is involved. Since suru lacks a nonfinite attributive form, the copula subcategorizes for all. No takes both NNS and VNs, and na takes ANs. In this subsection, I have argued that no in 1 is the nonfinite copula and that the Infl associated with no licenses nominative Case in 1, just as in 11b and 12b.

4.2. Accusative o and verbal nouns in Japanese. I have argued that nominative Case in 1 is licensed independently of the VN, but I argue that accusative Case in 1 depends crucially on the VN for its licensing. This kind of asymmetry between nominative and accusative Cases in the way they are licensed is justified. Under
the GB theory, nominative Case is assigned irrespective of the property of the verb, while accusative Case is closely tied to the property of the verb. This section discusses the relation between accusative Case and the property of the VN in 1.

We have seen in section 2 that HANBAI in 1 cannot take noun modifiers which usually occur in an NP headed by HANBAI, as shown in 7 below.

(1) Yamada-san ga tyuukosya o HANBAI no ori (ni) Yama-da-Mr. NOM used cars ACC sale ? occasion (on) ‘(on) the occasion when Mr. Yamada sells used cars’

(7) a. [NP seiryokute kina HANBAI] aggressive sale ‘aggressive sale’

b. *Yamada-san ga tyuukosya o seiryokute kina HANBAI no ori aggressive

Seiryokutekina in 7a is a noun modifier, occurring in an NP headed by HANBAI, but it cannot occur in 1, as shown in 7b. I argue that unlike HANBAI in 7a, HANBAI in 1 does not project as an NP, and that due to the absence of a nominal projection, seiryokutekina cannot occur in 1. 4 This explains the unacceptability of 7b. Sato (1993:14-15) refers to VNs like HANBAI in 1 as a bare VN as opposed to a modified VN. However, drawing on the research on ANs, such as Murasugi (1990), I refer to HANBAI in 1 as an unprojected VN. 7b, however, will be acceptable if tyuukosya is marked genitive, as shown in 7b’.

(7) b’. Yamada-san ga [tyuukosya no seiryokutekina HANBAI] no ori

In 7b’, HANBAI projects as an NP, and the two modifiers tyuukosya no and seiryokutekina occur inside the NP. 1 and 7b’, then, show that accusative Case is assigned only when HANBAI does not project. Now, I propose to explain the correlation between the unprojected VN and accusative Case assignment by arguing that the unprojected VN and the copula no form a complex predicate which assigns accusative Case.

My assumptions about accusative Case assignment in 1 are as follows. First, I accept Sato’s (1993:98) claim that all VNs have lexico-semantic representations, but that only bare (or unprojected) VNs project argument structures from them. I argue that VNs in Japanese differ from complex event nominals (Grimshaw 1990:45-150) in English in three respects. First, complex event nominals always project as an NP, while VNs do not always do so. Second, complex event nominals always project argument structures, while VNs do so only when they do not project as an NP. Third, complex event nominals have a suppressed argument position, while VNs do not. HANBAI, for example, has a lexico-semantic representation and an argument structure given in 20.

(20) HANBAI ‘sale’

a. Lexico-semantic representation: there is an event such that x sells y.

b. Argument structure: <Agent, Theme> 5

Note here that HANBAI assigns a theta-role to its external argument. Second, I assume following Hoekstra (forthcoming) that lexical verbs are composite elements consisting of a lexical basis and functional material. The lexical basis is either a
noun or an adjective. Functional material licenses a lexical basis, just as functional categories in general license lexical categories. I claim that the complex predicate HANBAI no in 1 is equivalent to a lexical verb, with HANBAI providing a lexical basis and no providing functional material. No, then, licenses the projection of 20b. Following Burzio (1986:178-186), I assume that HANBAI no assigns accusative Case because it assigns a theta-role to its external argument.

In this subsection, I have argued that the VN in 1 does not project as an NP but forms a complex predicate with the copula no and that the complex predicate theta-marks the two arguments and licenses accusative Case. Sato’s generalization that a modified VN cannot project an argument structure follows from the assumption that when licensed by no, only a zero-level VN projects an argument structure.

4.3. Analysis of the verbal noun construction. I now propose 21 as the structure of the verbal noun construction in 1.

(1) Yamada-san ga tyuukosya o HANBAI no ori (ni)  
    Yamada-Mr. NOM used cars ACC sale ? occasion (on)  
    ‘(on) the occasion when Mr. Yamada sells used cars’

(21)

```
(1) [NP [IP [NP [NP Yamada-san ga] VP [NP tyuukosya o] [V0 [N0 no] [V0 [I [-Tense]] [Attributive]]]]]
```

21 shows that 1 is an NP whose head noun is modified by a relative clause. This explains why its external syntax is exactly that of an NP. I follow Murasugi (1991:140-164) in taking relative clauses as IPs.6 HANBAI does not project as an NP, but forms a complex predicate with no. N0 and V0 are minimal projections, and the complex predicate is again a V0. I have borrowed this notation from Sells (1996a, b), where this kind of syntactic combination is proposed for the light verb construction.7 This combination is not morphological, partly because elements such as a focus particle can intervene between the VN and no, as shown in 22.

(22) Sato (1993:164)
    doo-koogi oTYOOKOO nomi no sai ni wa  
    the course ACC auditing only GEN situation in TOP  
    ‘when just auditing this course’

In 22, nomi ‘only’ intervenes between the VN TYOOKOO and no. As for clausal Case assignment in 1, HANBAI no assigns accusative Case to tyuukosya; and Infl,
nominative Case to Yamada-san. This explains why clausal Case is licensed, even when nouns with no aspectual or temporal meaning occur in place of ori. Furthermore, we need not introduce an underspecified category into the theory of grammar because nominative Case is assigned by Infl. Since no is the nonfinite attributive form, Infl in 21 has features to license that particular inflectional form.

One argument for the proposed analysis comes from Hoshi’s (1994:150-151) observation that GA/NO Conversion is possible in the verbal noun construction. Since GA/NO Conversion takes place in relative clauses, the proposed analysis predicts Hoshi’s observation. This prediction is borne out, as shown in 23.

(23) sengetu Taro ga/no Tokyo e SYUTTYOO no ori ni last month Taro NOM/GEN Tokyo to business trip COP occasion on hahao ya ga tazunete kita mother NOM visiting came

‘On the occasion when Taro made a business trip to Tokyo last month, his mother came to visit him.’

In 23, Taro can be marked genitive, and this fact is explained if we assume 21.

A second argument for 21 is that we can now treat unprojected VNs and ANs in the same way. I classify nouns in Japanese into three subcategories in 24.

(24) Three Subcategories of Nouns in Japanese
   a. Nominal Noun (NN): NNs always project as an NP.
   b. Verbal Noun (VN): VNs lead a double life; they sometimes project as an NP and sometimes do not.
   c. Adjectival Noun (AN): Most ANs never project as an NP. Some ANs (e.g. binboo ‘poverty’, kenkoo ‘health’) sometimes project as an NP and sometimes do not.

NN, VN and AN are subcategories of nouns because they are free forms morphologically (Sells 1996a). They contrast with verbs and adjectives, which are bound forms taking tense suffixes. ANs form a complex predicate with the copula when they do not project, as shown in 25.

(25) John ga okane ga hituyoo na ori
   John NOM money NOM need COP occasion

‘the occasion when John needs money’

In 25, hituyoo is an AN and does not project as an NP. Theta-theoretically, it is the main predicate but needs the copula to project its argument structure. The proposed analysis, then, can treat unprojected VNs and ANs in the same way.

The proposed analysis can also explain the dual character of VNs in terms of the distinction between morphological and syntactic categories in Japanese. Sells (1996a) proposes 26 to explain the dual character of VNs.

(26) Morphological and Syntactic Categories in Japanese (Sells 1996a)

Morphological Categories: N VN V A AN

Syntactic Categories:
In 26, VN is associated with both N' and V', because it is underspecified or dually categorized as V and N. AN is left unassociated, because it always combines with the copula, having no phrasal projection of its own. A is taken to project as a V' as a result of tense inflection. Now, the proposed analysis in 21 leads us to 27.

(27) Morphological and Syntactic Categories in Japanese

Morphological Categories:  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
NN \quad VN \quad AN \quad V \\
\end{array}
\]

Syntactic Categories:  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
NP \quad VP \\
\end{array}
\]

In 27, VN and AN are associated with both the NP and the VP. When they project, they are NPs. When they do not, they form a complex predicate which projects as a VP. I take the traditional position that A projects as an AP in Japanese. Note here that the three-way classification of Ns parallels that of syntactic categories. This parallelism is explained by taking VNs and ANs as a lexical basis on which to build complex predicates which function semantically as a VP and an AP. The proposed analysis in 21, thus, explains the dual character of VNs in terms of the discrepancy between morphological and syntactic categories in Japanese.

5. Conclusion. In this paper, I have first shown that some occurrences of no are the nonfinite attributive form of the copula, and that no in 1 is also the nonfinite copula. Then, I have argued that HANBAI in 1 does not project as an NP but forms a complex predicate with no. Finally, I have proposed an analysis of 1, where ori is modified by a relative clause and where the Infl of the relative clause licenses nominative Case and the complex predicate accusative Case. Before closing the paper, I would like to point out that VNs and ANs are mostly borrowings (Kageyama 1982, Murasugi 1990, Kubo 1992:119-121) and that this partly explains why they do not always project as an NP. In Japanese, Vs and As are bound morphemes, taking their own tense suffixes, while Ns are free morphemes. Because we cannot attach verbal or adjectival tense suffixes directly to Vs and As borrowed from other languages, we first change the syntactic category of borrowings into Ns (i.e. VNs and ANs). Since the recategorized borrowings are Ns in Japanese, it is only natural that VNs and ANs should project as NPs. However, once they do, they miss the original purpose of making up the shortage of Vs and As in the vocabulary of Japanese. In order to fulfill the purpose, they do not project as an NP but form complex predicates with the copula. This turns VNs back into their original syntactic category, namely verbs, and ANs into something similar to their original category, namely adjectival verbs. Two stages of recategorization, then, are involved in making use of the borrowed Vs and As in Japanese.

NOTES

* I would like to thank the BLS 23 audience for their comments on my paper.

1 The following abbreviations are used in this paper: NOM = nominative Case, ACC = accusative Case, GEN = genitive Case, COP = copula, PRE = present tense, PAST = past tense, TOP = topic marker.
2 Sells (1996b) also claims that *da* is ‘both inflected and tensed’, while *na* is ‘inflected but not tensed’.

The opposition between the allomorphs *no* and *na* is neutralized immediately before the nominalizer *no*. See Miyagawa (1987) for relevant discussions.

3 The copula either subcategorizes for an NP (i.e. a maximal projection of NNs, ANs, and VNs) or, as I argue below, forms a complex predicate with a zero-level projection of ANs and VNs. On this score, it is similar to *suru* ‘do’.

4 Yoon (1991) and Han (1996) give the same argument concerning VNs in Korean light verb constructions.

5 Contra Sato, I assume that the external theta role Agent is not suppressed.

6 In 21, I ignore the relative operator and its trace.

7 Sells (1996a, b) proposes this syntactic combination for the light verb construction with *suru* ‘do’ in Japanese and *hata* ‘do’ in Korean.

8 Urushibara (1994:114-116) points out similarities between the VN in 2b and the AN in 25 and refers to both types of construction as a light verb construction.
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