

Comparison of Noun Modifying Constructions

Hideo Teramura

Please cite as follows:

Teramura, Hideo (1980) *Meishishūshokubu no hikaku* [Comparison of noun-modifying structures]. Originally published in *Nichieigohikakukouza dainikan bunpou* [A course in comparative studies of Japanese and English, Volume 2, Grammar] (Taishukan Publishing Company Limited) and reproduced in *Teramura Hideo Ronbunshū II – Gengogaku–Nihongokyōiku-hen* [The collected works of Hideo Teramura II – Works on linguistics and Japanese language education] (Kurosio Publishers. 1993). English translation made available by the National Institute of Japanese Language and Linguistics (NINJAL) on: <https://mmsrv.ninjal.ac.jp/adnominal-modification/> (accessed on DDMMYYYY).

Comparison of Noun Modifying Constructions

1. Preliminaries to comparison

It goes without saying that, when taking up two languages so different in their make up as Japanese and English as objects to be compared, one must be careful in using the same grammatical terms to describe both languages. The objective of this work is to investigate noun modification structures in Japanese and English, but before entering the main argumentation, let us take a simple look at some concepts and terminology that will be essential in advancing our comparison.

First, unless we determine what we mean by the terms *meishi* in Japanese and “noun” in English and by *shūshoku-suru* in Japanese and “modify” in English, we can proceed no further. Once one starts to consider the problem, it becomes endless, but here at the least we need to be aware of what the standard is in Japanese and in English by which each language determines if a given word is, respectively, a *meishi* or a noun. Without this recognition, there will be the continuing problem that one might end up simply concluding on the basis of the fact that the Japanese *Sensoo ga owatta toki* [war NOM end.PST time] becomes ‘when the war ended’ in English that *toki* ‘time’ is a conjunction and that the whole is an adverbial clause; or, conversely, since in the construction *kare ga katu kanoosei* [he NOM win.NONPST possibility], *kare ga katu* modifies the noun *kanoosei* as one construction in Japanese, one might conclude that “the possibility that he will win” is an ordinary noun modification construction in English (or, conversely that the Japanese construction is an “appositive clause”). This, despite the fact the real difficulty – and amusingness as well – of comparative research is actually to be found in such problems.

A common characteristic of *meishi* ‘nouns’ in both Japanese and English is probably the syntactic characteristic that they can become the subjects and objects of verbs. As is well known, the term *shugo* ‘subject’ is one about which there are diverse arguments arising in great numbers, but here, let us use the term to refer to those noun phrases that have the case particle *ga* attached. Direct objects are those with the particle *o* attached. In the case of Japanese, since *ga* and *o* can be viewed as having the same kinds of function as the particles *ni* ‘DAT, to’, *kara* ‘from’, *e* ‘toward’ or *de* ‘LOC, INS’, being able to co-occur with these so-called case particles should be given as the first qualification for nounhood. In English as well, the term object is not limited to objects of transitive verbs but is also used for nouns preceded by prepositions, so the situation is parallel to the case of case particles other than *ga* and *o* in Japanese. For most cases, in both Japanese and English, this is sufficient, but we cannot escape the fact that there are marginal cases, that is, cases in which the “nouniness” is a delicate question. Here, I would like to keep just the following in mind regarding Japanese. Japanese words have two aspects, one facing forward and one facing backward and at times these two aspects may differ. The ability to co-occur with case particles observed above is a backward-facing linking relation, but nouns are also distinguished from verbs and adjectives by the ability to form a combination with a preceding *sono* ‘that-’ or “something+*no* [GEN]”. This is the aspect of what forms it can occur following. For example, both *tukue* ‘table’ and *Taroo* ‘Tarō (personal name)’ are nouns whether viewed from the front or from the back and, moreover, since either can appear in the pattern *sore wa* _____ *da* [that TOP _____ COP] ‘That is (a) _____.’, their independence is high. When it

comes to *toki* ‘time’, *mama* ‘state, condition’, *tumori* ‘intention’, or *hazu* ‘expectation’, however, they function as nouns in terms of what they can follow, as in *sono toki* ‘that time’ or *sensoo no toki* ‘the time of the war’, but, on the other hand, in terms of what they can be followed by, rather than freely co-occurring with case particles to form an element (complement) to develop the proposition in the next higher clause, they more commonly combine with what precedes them to function adverbially with regard to what follows them. Furthermore, *tumori* and *hazu* accompanied by the copula *da* form a sentence-final phrase that could be said to function like an auxiliary. In terms of English, the use of *toki* above, rather than being like “when”, is probably closer to that of ‘the moment’ in ‘the moment I saw her’. The examples just given are examples of what are called *keishiki meishi* ‘(lit) formal nouns’ in Japanese; later we will reconsider what “modified by a clause” means.

Next is the term *shūshoku*. This term also is one about which the more one thinks, the less one understands, but here we will use Bloomfield’s term and define it as (in the case of noun modification) a form that attaches to a noun (the head noun) forming “an endocentric construction centered on a noun and functioning as a nominal constituent in a higher clause”. Under this definition, the English so-called appositive clause construction is also included. How to handle adverbial particles in Japanese remains a problem, but since we will have our hands full just with constructions falling under the above definition, we will not have the luxury of going into that problem in detail.

Thirdly, and this is in and of itself a major problem, we cannot avoid the concepts of “sentence” and “clause”. When we try categorizing noun modification constructions in Japanese according to their surface structures, we end up wanting to distinguish patterns like *sono hanasi* ‘that story’ or *Urasima Taroo no hanasi* ‘the story of Urashima Tarō’ from the pattern (or couple of patterns) of *mukasi obaasan kara kiita hanasi* ‘the story I heard from my grandmother long ago’ or *Urasima ga kame ni Ryuuguu e turete itte morau hanasi* ‘the story of Urashima’s getting the turtle to take him to the Palace of the Dragon King’. This is because in the latter examples the modifying portion takes a form that could stand alone as a sentence if uttered in a real situation. But what does it mean to say “(something in the form of) a sentence is modifying a noun”? In English, there is a clear pattern of a subject noun phrase with a finite verb and if that pattern is maintained even when embedded within a larger sentence, it is possible to distinguish that as a “clause” as opposed to an independent sentence, but in Japanese, nouns marked with *ga* are complements just as those marked by *o*, *ni*, or *kara* are and, like those marked by *o*, *ni*, or *kara*, can be omitted when they are clear from the context or the speech situation. In addition, there is nothing that can be termed a “finite verb”. Whether something is a sentence or not, formally speaking, depends solely on whether or not the predicate (verb, adjective, or (noun +) copula) is in a conclusive form. There are quite a number of analyses of predicate inflections in addition to that of Japanese school grammar, but here we have put the inflectional forms into a chart with the descriptive terms we will use in this work.

Form	Verb	Adjective	Copula
<i>Genzaikei</i> (non-past form/ present form)	<i>suru</i> ‘do, make’	<i>atui</i> ‘hot’	<i>da</i> ‘be’

<i>Kakokei</i> (past form)	<i>sita</i>	<i>atukatta</i>	<i>datta</i>
<i>Suiryō/Ikōkei</i> (presumptive/ volitional form)	<i>siyoo</i>	<i>atukaroo</i>	<i>daroo</i>
<i>Kako Suiryōkei</i> (past suppositional form)	<i>sitaroo</i>	<i>atukattaroo</i>	<i>dattaroo</i>
<i>Meireikei</i> (imperative form)	<i>siro</i>		
<i>-tara Jōkenkei</i> (-tara conditional form/conditional form)	<i>sitara</i>	<i>atukattara</i>	<i>dattara</i>
<i>-reba Jōkenkei</i> (-reba conditional form/provisional form)	<i>sureba</i>	<i>atukereba</i>	<i>nara</i>
<i>Ren'yōkei</i> (adverbial form)	<i>si</i>	<i>atuku</i>	
<i>-te-kei</i> (te-form/gerundive form)	<i>site</i>	<i>atukute</i>	<i>de</i>
<i>-tari-kei</i> (representative form)	<i>sitari</i>	<i>atukattari</i>	<i>dattari</i>

Of these, those down to the fifth line are used conclusively (=sentence finally). For convenience, in this work we will call these *chinjutsukei* ‘modality forms’. However, just as the *genzaikei* forms and the *kakokei* forms do not always reference the present or the past, it is also the case that *chinjutsukei* forms are separate from “*chinjutsu* ‘mood, modality’”.

When we consider so-called relative clauses and content clauses later, as well as when we compare modification by an adjective in English and Japanese, one thing that emerges as a problem is the recognition that a sentence is made up of both a propositional content component (or *koto* ‘fact, matter’) that describes events in the objectively observable world and a *chinjutsu* (or “mood”) component that expresses the speakers subjective stance toward that content, such

as affirmative judgment, supposition, hopes, demands, or doubts. For example, the sentence *Ame ga huru daroo* ‘It will probably rain’ can be analyzed as composed of the propositional content *ame ga huru* ‘it rains (lit. rain falls)’ and *daroo* ‘will probably’ expressing the speaker’s suppositional judgment with regard to that content. The non-past form *huru*, which only has the function of concluding the proposition in this example, additionally carries the function of “judgment, declarative statement” in *Kon’ya ame ga huru* ‘Tonight it will rain’. In other words, the forms termed *chinjutsukei* are forms that can carry the function of conveying some sort of *chinjutsu* when used conclusively. Although it was Watanabe (1971) that called for a distinction between *jojutsu* ‘proposition’ and *chinjutsu* ‘modality’ and, further developing TOKIEDA Motoki’s *si* versus *ji* distinction, thoroughly investigated the nature of sentence formation, this kind of argument is not restricted to Japanese language studies; rather, recent trends in linguistic research abroad have made it clear that such questions are not necessarily to be kept at a distance as merely theoretical grammar. How the *chinjutsusei* ‘modal quality’ or *chinjutsu no doai* ‘degree of modality’ actually relate to syntax is something that we will consider below with individual concrete observations.

Since this has gotten somewhat long as an introduction, let us move on to the comparison of noun modification in Japanese and English.

Comprehensive descriptions categorizing noun modification in terms of forms or patterns are found in both traditional English grammar and Japanese language studies. From the view of Japanese-English comparative works, there is Kleinjans (1958) from a structuralist point of view followed by Isshiki (1968), which emphasizes problems in English acquisition. It would probably be expected for us to first present those works categorizing English and Japanese surface patterns, but, since that would take up too much space, we will divide noun modification constructions broadly into four groups and indicate the points that warrant special attention on which each differ between English and Japanese. Since, of these four groups, we devote the most attention to the last, namely relative clauses and content clauses and their various contracted forms, here we will first briefly describe the other groups.

2. Noun modification by a determiner or determiner-like words

Concerning noun modification in both Japanese and English, there are cases where the modification is done by a type of word (*genteishi* ‘determiner’) that is used exclusively for the purpose of noun modification and cases where words that have other various structural functions are used for that purpose. In this section, we will compare words of the former type and other words like them in Japanese and English.

The archetypical kind of word with the exclusive function of noun modification would be the articles (a, an, and the) in English and the adnominal forms of the *ko-so-a-do* series in Japanese (*kono* ‘this~’, *sono* ‘that (proximal)~’, *ano* ‘that (distal)~’, and *dono* ‘which~’; *konna* ‘this kind of~’, *sonna* ‘that (proximal) kind of~’, *anna* ‘that (distal) kind of~’, and *donna* ‘what kind of~’) as well as other words classified as *rentaishi* ‘adnominals’.

The *rentaishi* are also called *fukutaishi* and some of the main members of this class include: *aru (hi)* ‘a certain (day)’, *arayuru* ‘all, every’, *iwayuru* ‘so-called’, *tonda (koto)*

‘unimaginable (fact)’, and *taisita (otoko)* ‘important (man)’. There are competing analyses for others such as *rei.no* ‘the usual~’, *honno* ‘a mere~’, *saru (tooku)* ‘the past (tenth of the month)’, and *kitaru (taikai)* ‘the coming (convention)’, but looking at their uses in Modern Japanese, they fit into the adnominal class.

In English, the possessive forms of pronouns are held to be in the determiner class, but we will postpone consideration of them to the next section. The patterns “this (book)” or “that (boy)” are held to be the adnominal use of pronouns, and we will tentatively treat them as such here. Although quite different in nature, words like “every (student)”, “no (student)”, and “either (road)” can only be used adnominally. Although also capable of being used independently as pronouns, “all”, “both”, “each”, and “such” are very close to the above semantically and functionally. In addition, there are expressions of quantity like “many”, “much”, “few”, and “little”. We will consider those that can be used in the same form both predicatively (*jutte*, nexus) and adnominally (*sōte* junction), but for which the meaning differs between the two uses in section 4, but, because they are somewhat different from the general adjectives discussed there, we will briefly consider patterns like “certain (countries)” and “one (day)” here.

The group discussed above are determiners and closely related words. Numerals are next in affiliation, followed by adnominal adjectives that we will consider in section 4. Now let us examine these forms from the perspective of their form and meanings.

Looking at these determiners, it is clear that there at least two kinds of restriction associated with them: one kind simply points to something or someone before one’s eyes or to something that has been previously mentioned in the linguistic context; the other restricts by specifying some characteristic or situation, selecting a subset, so to speak, that has some quality.

Sakuma (1957) introduced the theories of Henri Frei as well as the concept of “la translation” from Lucien Tesnière, attempting early on a structuralist analysis of Japanese noun modification constructions. Frei called what we have been referring to as noun modification “determination”, which Sakuma translated as *kettei* ‘determination, decision’, and divided it into three subtypes: (i) *caractérisation (teisei)*, (ii) *indication (shitei)*, and (iii) *spécification (tokutei)*, where the terms in parentheses indicate Sakuma’s translations.

Japanese *kono*, *sono*, and *ano* and English “this” and “that” could be called the primordial forms of *specification*. (The difference between the three-way distinction in Japanese and the two-way distinction in English is an interesting topic in itself, but since it is not a problem unique to noun modification, we will not go into it here.) Compared to these, which truly specify an object by pointing to it, English “the” can be said to be higher in abstractness in that it is used with the understanding that, even if the speaker does not point to the object it is attached to, the hearer recognizes the reference. There is nothing that corresponds to it in Japanese. However, to the extent that *the* is used when the object is not in the physical environment where the speaker and hearer are located but refers to something depending on their shared knowledge, this usage is also found with Japanese *ano*. Research on articles has continued throughout the ages from a variety of different approaches. It would not do for us to get into the problem of articles here, but since the recent distinction between “specific” and “nonspecific” is also related to Japanese, it is worth considering. (For detailed discussion, see such works as

Jackendoff (1972), Selkirk (1977), and Hawkins (1978).)

For example, in the sentence “John wants to catch a fish”, “a fish” is indefinite in any case, but it can be interpreted either as “any fish” or as “a certain, particular fish” that John has in mind. In the latter case, “a fish” is “specific” (as opposed to “definite”), but explaining how a hearer interprets whether a noun phrase with the article “a” attached is specific or not (or, as in the above example, ambiguous) is difficult. This line of argument is interesting, but it appears we need to approach the problem from a slightly different angle when considering Japanese.

In Japanese as well, in answer to a question like *Konna tokoro de nani o site iru no ka* [this.kind.of place LOC what ACC do.GER be.NONPST NMLZ Q] ‘What are you doing in a place like this?’, one might say, *Tyuugokuzin no gakusei o matte ru n da* [Chinese.person GEN student ACC wait.GER be.NONPST NMLZ COP.NONPST] ‘I’m waiting for a Chinese student.’ In this case, we can probably think of two interpretations, one in which being “Chinese” and being “a student” are both taken as characterizations, and thus *Tyuugokuzin no gakusei* could refer to anyone who is both Chinese and a student, and the other in which the person is waiting for a particular, specific person. However, if the speaker wants to convey the meaning that he is waiting for a particular, specific person, he would probably use one of the following two expressions. If the speaker thinks that the hearer will understand who he is referring to, based on some shared past experience, he might say, *ano Tyuugokuzin no ...* [that Chinese.person GEN ...] ‘that Chinese ...’. On the other hand, if he has a particular person in mind, but the hearer does not know that person, and the speaker sees no reason to inform the hearer who the particular person he has in mind is, he may say, *aru Tyuugokuzin no ...* [some Chinese.person GEN ...] ‘some Chinese ...’.

In Jackendoff (1972), mentioned earlier, he says when considering whether a noun with an indefinite article attached is specific or nonspecific that, when such a noun stands as subject, like “a man” in “A man wants to see you”, it is always specific. In Japanese, in such a case one would probably use neither *ano*, which specifies that the reference is within the hearer’s knowledge, nor *aru*, which shows that he may know who it is but has no need to convey that to the hearer, but one would instead probably say, *dareka ga kite ru yo* [someone NOM come.GER be.NONPST SFP] ‘Someone has come / Somebody is here (to see you)’. Rather than being indefinite but specific, in this case I think it would be better to describe it as definite, but unknown (to the speaker). It would not do for us to go into problems with the semantic interpretation Jackendoff proposes here, but, when considering the use of *aru*~ or *ano*~ it is necessary to consider “specification” from the view of the speaker’s consciousness and his attitude toward the hearer. (Incidentally, the meaning of *aru*~ described above can also be seen in English “certain”.)

Besides the determiners discussed above, which do not refer to any quality or content but merely “indicate” the noun they modify, there are others, like *tonda* (*sawagi*) ‘unimaginable (ruckus)’, *taisita* (*otoko*) ‘important (man)’, *roku.na* (*e.mo*) ‘satisfactory (picture.even)’, “elder”, and “upper”, that, in Frei’s terms, express a “characterization”. In section 4, where we consider adjectives, we will link these latter ones to adjectives that can only appear in prenominal position. Between these two types lie words like *aruyuru* ‘all’, *subete.no* ‘all’, “all”, “every”, and “some”. These all have the characteristic that they have the function of limiting the scope of the

proposition or judgment. These tie in with “many” and “few” and then further with quantifiers. Compared to Japanese, studies on quantifiers are much more advanced in English in which there are studies in semantics drawing on logic and philosophy and which attempt to link such studies to syntax. There are many problems worthy of study, such as the adverbial qualities of quantifier expressions and the possibility or impossibility of using them in adnominal constructions, but we will move on, ending our consideration of determiners and adnominals (*rentaishi*) here.

3. Noun modification by nouns with and without case marking

In this section, we will consider the modification of nouns by other nouns or by phrases that have nouns as their core.

In both English and Japanese, strings of two or more nouns can be observed in which one modifies or restricts the other. Since, however, there is normally no external form indicating the relation between them, their semantic interpretation must depend primarily on the semantic characteristics of each of the two nouns and interpretation of the relation between them may also require social knowledge, that is, non-linguistic knowledge. For example, “snow man” means “a human figure made of snow”, “milk man” means “a man who delivers milk”, and “garbage man” means “a man who comes to pick up the garbage”. Naturally social knowledge is different from country to country. *Yukiotoko* ‘(lit) snow man, a man who brings snowy weather with him’ is not the same as “snow man” and simply changing *yukionna* to “snow woman” will not make the word intelligible to English speakers. (Note: It indicates the female counterpart to *yukiotoko*).

What patterns there are for two nouns to be linked together has naturally been studied in traditional grammatical studies as well, and one work that tries to explain the relation as being generated from a sentence is the already classic Lees (1960). Okutsu (1975) considered Japanese compound nouns using essentially the same approach. Transformational grammar has undergone big changes since Lees’ time, but is probably natural to turn to an explanation with a verb-centered sentence or something close to it to express explicitly the semantic **relation** between two nouns. The examples given above are the same. That is, the relations between two or more nouns are those of actors, patients, locations, means, times, and so on with respect to an action or an event expressed by a verb. For example, with respect to the verb “deliver”, “man” plays the role of actor and “milk” that of patient. Even if the relation described is a complex one requiring social common knowledge, in essence, the interpretation probably happens pretty much as just described.

The propositional content of a sentence is formed with the predicate verb as the core and a set of nouns that stand in a variety of (semantic, case) relationships with the verb, where the relations are expressed in Japanese by case particles like *ga* ‘NOM’, *o* ‘ACC’, *ni* ‘DAT, LOC, GOAL’ or *kara* ‘ABLATIVE’ and in English by position with respect to the verb (nominative and accusative cases) or by prepositions. In a structure in which N_1 modifies N_2 , there are cases in which N_1 is in some sort of case relation vis a vis N_2 . These are cases in which N_2 is a nominalization of a verb or in which it is easy to associate it with some verb. Let us start with examples with *kara* and *e*.

(1) a. *Sono tegami wa Biruma kara kita.*

- that letter TOP Burma from come.PST
 ‘That letter came from Burma’
- b. *Biruma kara no tegami*
 ‘a/the letter from Burma’
- (1)’ a. The letter came from Burma.
 b. the/a letter from Burma
- (2) a. *Sono tegami wa hensyuusya e*
 that letter TOP editor to
ateta mono da.
 address.PST thing COP
 ‘That letter is one addressed to the editor.’
- b. *hensyuusya e no tegami*
 ‘a/the letter to the editor’
- (2)’ a. The letter is addressed to the editor.
 b. the/a letter to the editor
- (3) a. *Tyuugoku to koosyoo.suru.*
 China with negotiate.NONPST
 ‘(Someone will) negotiate with China.’
- b. *Tyuugoku to no koosyoo*
 ‘negotiations with China’
- (3)’ a. negotiate with China
 b. negotiation with China

One thing one immediately notices in comparing the English and Japanese above is that, while in English the pattern “preposition + noun” links up with a noun in just the same form as when it links up with a verb, in Japanese the particle *no* must be attached in order to have the pattern “noun + particle” modify another noun. (That is why *kara*, *e*, and the like are called adverbial (case) particles (*ren'yō joshi*) and *no* is called an adnominal particle (*rentai joshi*).) The fact that among Westerners learning Japanese a mistake like *Kore wa watasi no sensei kara o suisenzyoo desu* [this TOP I GEN teacher from recommendation COP] is common is not surprising when you consider this difference.

Incidentally, if you wonder whether the Japanese pattern “Noun + particle + *no* → N” always corresponds to the English pattern “N ← Prep + N”, the answer is that they do not always

match. Consider the following examples.

- (4) a. *Kanada ni sunde iru.*
Canada LOC live.GER be.NONPST
'is living in Canada'
- b. *Kanada no oji*
GEN uncle
'Canadian uncle / uncle in Canada'
- c. **Kanada ni no oji*
- (4)' a. My uncle lives in Canada.
b. my uncle in Canada
- (5) a. *Kyoto de hirakareta.*
Kyōto LOC hold.PASS.PST
'be held on Kyoto'
- b. *Kyoto no taikai*
convention
'the Kyoto convention / the convention in Kyoto'
- c. *Kyoto de no taikai*
'the convention in Kyoto'
- (5)' a. The convention was held in Kyoto.
b. the convention in Kyoto

Namely, a rule states that when *~ni* modifies a noun, it does not appear as *~ni.no* but simply as *~no*. On the other hand, in the case of *de*, apparently either form is possible. A natural question, then, is what other particles besides *ni* are omitted before *no*? As can be seen from the following, *ga* and *o* also drop, becoming *~no* alone rather than *~ga.no* or *~o.no*.

- (6) a. *Akutagawa ga zisatu.sita.*
Akutagawa NOM commit.suicide.PST
'Akutagawa committed suicide.'
- b. *Akutagawa no zisatu*
'Akutagawa's suicide'
- (7) a. *Taisi o yuukai.suru*
ambassador ACC kidnap.NONPST
'kidnap the ambassador'

- b. *taisi no yuukai*
 ‘the ambassador’s kidnapping’

The observations above can be summarized as follows.

When an adverbial element of the form “N + case particle” is converted to an adnominal element through the addition of *no*, *ga*, *o*, and *ni* disappear, appearing as just “N *no*”. Case particles like *kara*, *e*, *made*, or *to* remain and take *no* following them. *De* can appear in either pattern.

Something anyone looking at this statement will notice is that these patterns are not limited to the adverbial → adnominal conversion but are actually instances of “the tightness of the link between case (particles) and the predicate verb” that is a perennial problem and is also found in the relation between the topicalizing *wa* and case particles, in the conditions on formation of noun modification structures that we will consider in section 5.2, as well as in the formation of compound nouns.

Let us here switch our attention to English. In English, we find the opposite situation from Japanese where some case markers (particles) disappear in the conversion from adverbial to adnominal. In English, it happens that in cases in which there is no case marking (or more precisely, there is no preposition marking a case relation) in the adverbial use, a preposition must be added in the adnominal use.

- (8) a. They visit the moon.
 b. the visit to the moon
- (9) a. He married the widow.
 b. his marriage with (to) the widow

In other words, although on the surface the structure looks like a transitive verb and its direct object, when the direct object is the “goal” in terms of content, prepositions like “to”, “toward”, or “at” are required in the adnominal pattern, and when it shows the other party in a common, shared activity, “with” appears. What about “real” direct objects that receive the action of the verb, or are produced by the action of the verb, or that are the objects of thought or perception? Looking at the examples, the preposition “of” seems to be added most commonly.

- (10) a. They destroyed the bridge.
 b. their destruction of the bridge

However, there are also cases like the following in which the possessive case appears just as in the case of a subject, to be considered next.

(11) Picasso's portrait

What happens in the case of a subject? It may appear in the possessive case as above, or it may appear with "of", or it might appear with "by".

(12) the death of a salesman

(13) the denials of involvement by John Mitchell and the CRP

The observations for English, then, can be summarized as follows.

The pattern "Prep + N" is used both for adnominal modification and for adverbial modification. When the modifying noun (N_1) stands in a subject relation to the verbal meaning expressed by the modified (= head noun, N_2), it takes the forms "N's" or "of N" or "by N". When N_1 stands in a semantic object relation to N_2 , it most commonly appears as "of N_1 ", but it also takes the form "N's" and, if there is a preposition that appropriately expresses the relation between the two, it may also take forms like "with N", "to N" or "against N".

We have outlined the general rules for first Japanese and now English for when one noun forms a modifier—modified structure with another noun including various semantic relations between them. When one examines them closely, while it may appear as though there are problems unique to each language, it is also apparent that there is quite a considerable portion that is basically common to both. Also, it is at the same time apparent where they differ and where those differences lie in the whole picture and what comparative weight they carry.

What they have in common is that when the semantic relation between a noun and another noun that modifies it is such that a native speaker can understand it even though it is not overtly marked, only a form that has the sole function of showing (an adnominal) union is needed to link them together. In Japanese that function is borne by the adnominal particle *no* and in English it is borne by the possessive form and the preposition "of".

Where they differ is that, whereas in Japanese the single form *no* bears the function of adnominal modification, in English, since prepositions other than "of" can be used to show adnominal modification, the functional load on "of" is not as high as that on *no*.

Because of this, when Japanese speak or write English, they may just use "of" where an English speaker would differentiate among, for example, "in", "at", "on", "to", "against", "with", and "about".

The discussion above has focused on cases in which the modified noun is a deverbal noun, cases in which the noun has a clear morphological relation to a verb, or cases in which there is a verb to which the modified noun has such a deep relation that it is easily imagined (for example, "letter" and "go/come", among others), but when a form that has the exclusive function of indicating adnominal modification, like *no* or "of", develops, the semantic relation between

two nouns linked by such forms goes beyond something that is reducible to a simple case relationship and gradually expands its range, gradually becoming more complex.

syatyoo no okusan ‘the company president’s wife’, *syatyoo no Matusita san* ‘the company president, Mr. Matsushita’, *usotuki no Taroo* ‘Tarō, the liar’, *Taroo no usotuki!* ‘You liar, Tarō’, *sakura no hana* ‘cherry blossoms’, *si no hyooryuu* ‘drifting to one’s death’, *ryoori no tanosimi* ‘the joy of cooking’, *syuuwai no syooko* ‘evidence of accepting a bribe’, *sitaihuzyuuuzi no sisetu* ‘a facility for physically handicapped children’ ...

a friend of mine, my vision of Marco Puzo, an audience of enthusiastic reviewers, the excitement of changing one’s life with a bank-breaking night, the reality of black holes, evidence of a plot to kill the king, ...

When the bond between the nouns becomes even stronger, even the *no* or “of” disappears and the two nouns join together to really become one word (a compound noun). The reason that two nouns can join together this way even without an explicit marker of their semantic relationship is because, as mentioned at the beginning of this section, someone who lives in the linguistic society in which they are used can, from the syntactic and semantic properties of the nouns, immediately place them within known boundaries. A detailed categorization is, however, beyond the scope of this work.

4. Noun modification by adjectives

Probably the archetypical type of word modifying nouns is the adjective, but in both Japanese and English, adjectives have the additional important role of forming the predicate of a sentence and, on this point, are different from the determiners discussed in section 2. We could probably say that adjectives lie somewhere in between determiners and verbs, which have the more fundamental role of forming the core of a predicate.

One of the biggest differences between adjectives in Japanese and in English is that, as we saw in section 1, particularly when we looked at conjugational patterns, Japanese adjectives basically conjugate just like verbs do and can form a predicate in their *chinjutsukei* with nothing added. Thus, if we were to restrict ourselves to Japanese, there would be no reason to distinguish between modification by adjectives and the case of modification by a clause or a verb taken up in the next section. However, the fact that in English (whatever one conceives as a “deep structure”), an adjective can be used with no addition as a noun modifier but when used as a predicate, the addition of the be-verb or a verb similar to it (like “grow” or “look”) is necessary and the fact that it is doubtful whether any tense marking like “non-past” is present on the *akai* ‘red’ in a pattern like *akai hana* ‘red flower’ leads to setting up this separate section.

When considering noun modification by adjectives, the first problem, both syntactically and semantically, that arises is, as mentioned above, the differences between the use of adjective as a predicate versus an adnominal use. Sakuma (1957), holding that Jespersen’s “nexus” (e.g. The flower is red) and “junction” (e.g. the red flower) were also important concepts in opposition in Japanese, and, giving them the translational equivalents of *sōtei* for the former

and *juttei* for the latter, tried to explain the opposition in terms of “conversion (*tenkan*)” from *juttei* to *sōtei*. There are those among national language studies scholars who use Jespersen’s terms without translation, but we will use Sakuma’s terminology here.

This explanation of *sōtei* by conversion from *juttei* – an approach also seen in the analysis of adjectives in early transformational grammar – cannot be said to be mistaken in and of itself, but, as will become clear below, it is overly simplistic both in terms of syntax and in terms of semantics.

It has been pointed out in English traditional grammars that there are some adjectives that have only the *sōtei* use and cannot be used in the *juttei* use and, conversely, that there are adjectives that have only the *juttei* use. As examples of the former one finds “an *elder* brother”, “*former* President”, “the *latter* part”, and “the *main* reason”, and as examples of the latter, one finds “The baby is *asleep*”, “The girl is *sorry*”, “He is *alive*”, and “The boy is *afraid*”. There are also grammars that link adjectives in the *sōtei* use to adverbs, as in “an early riser” ← “rise early”.

Bolinger (1967), in order to explain the facts above and also to account for the fact that an adjective may have a different meaning depending on whether it is used *sōtei* or *juttei* (for example, “the criminal lawyer”, which means “a lawyer who specializes in criminal cases”, as opposed to “he is a criminal”) in a comprehensive way, proposed that there are two “be- verbs”, one that shows a temporary state of the subject (“occasion”) and one that shows a characteristic of the subject (“characteristic”) and further that it is only the “be-verb” that describes a characteristic that undergoes the *juttei*-to-*sōtei* conversion. In addition, he proposed that when an adjective restricts a noun, it may either make a restriction within the set of things represented by the noun (“reference modification”), as in “criminal lawyer”, which selects one type of lawyer, or it may individuate the referent of the noun it restricts (“referent modification”).

It is not clear how much relevance the discussion above has when considering Japanese adjectives. However, as mentioned in section 2, there are adjectives in Japanese that have a *sōtei* use but cannot be converted to a *juttei* use and, conversely, there are some, albeit only a few, like *ooi* ‘many’ and *sukunai* ‘few’ that are difficult to use in the *sōtei* use.

<i>Kyoo</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>kyaku</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>ooi.</i>
today	TOP	guests	NOM	many

‘There are a lot of guests today’

* <i>Kyoo</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>ooi</i>	<i>kyaku</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>kite</i>	<i>iru.</i>
today	TOP	many	guests	NOM	come.GER	be.NONPST

‘Many guests have come today.’

<i>UFO</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>mokugeki.sita</i>	<i>hito</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>sukunai</i>
UFO	ACC	witness.PST	person	TOP	few

‘People who have witnessed UFOs are few.’

* <i>Sukunai hito</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>UFO</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>mokugeki.sita</i>
-----------------------	-----------	------------	----------	----------------------

few person NOM UFO ACC witness.PST
 ‘Few people witnessed UFO’s.’

kami.no.ke *no* *ooi* *hito*
 hair GEN many person
 ‘a person with a lot of hair’

kono *hen* *de* (*itiban*) *ooi* *ziko*
 this area LOC most many accident
 ‘the (most) common accident around here’

It is also interesting that the *too* ‘distant’ in *tooku no sinseki yori tikaku no tomodati* [distant GEN relative than close GEN friend] ‘better a close friend than a far-off relative’ and *sono sinseki wa too* [that relative TOP distant] ‘that relative is distant’ is similar to “remote” in having different meanings in *sōtei* and *juttei* uses.

Looking just at *ooi* and *sukunai*, it appears at first glance that the restrictions on their use are exactly opposite those of English “many”, “few”, “no”, and numbers. See Yoshida (1976) for the *juttei* use of “many”. Also, although Nakagawa (1975) is primarily concerned with Chinese, it is interesting to see the universal aspects of this problem.

A satisfactory generalization of these facts is left for the future.

There is also the problem of the “restrictive” use and “non-restrictive” use of adjectives, but this will be taken up in the next section.

5. Noun modification by verbs or clauses

5.1 Introduction

In this section, we will take up the following kind of noun modification. First, in English, we will focus on so-called relative clauses, appositive clauses, noun modification by verbal forms (infinitive, participle, verbal noun), and the form “Preposition + Noun + Ving” modifying a noun; in Japanese, we will essentially look at noun modification by various forms of a verb where the *chinjutsukei* are involved.

If we were merely looking at the question from within each language, we could describe them by dividing the above forms into some number of categories by their formal characteristics, but if we try to go beyond the surface differences between English and Japanese and draw out the interesting similarities and differences, we really need to cast our net widely and capture all of the above. However, in order to contrast the various structures formally, we need something that we can use as a common viewpoint. Thus, we will set up the following two perspectives.

The first is to divide the syntactic relation between the modifier and the modified noun into the following two categories. In both Japanese and English, there are cases in which the

noun being modified has some sort of semantic case relationship with the modifying portion (with the verb at its core), that is, it is modified while at the same time being in a relation such that the two parts could form a sentence, and cases for which this is not the case. In Japanese, for example, both (1) and (2) are noun modification structures, that is, in both the underlined part is “modified or restricted” by what comes before it.

- (1) *sanma* *o* *yaku* *otoko*
 saury ACC grill.NONPST man
 ‘the man (who is) grilling saury’
- (2) *sanma* *o* *yaku* *nioi*
 saury ACC grill.NONPST smell
 ‘the smell from (someone) grilling saury’

However, probably anyone who is a speaker of Japanese would see the modifier and the head noun in (1) as being linked in a modifier-modified pattern while at the same time being related as *otoko ga sanma o yaku* [man NOM saury ACC grill.NONPST] ‘the man grills a saury’. However, the same speaker would probably not have the same understanding in the case of (2). The *nioi* ‘smell’ neither does the grilling nor is grilled. The same phenomenon can be observed with English noun modification constructions. The reader will probably recall the structural difference between a “that” relative and an appositive clause.

- (3) the report that he wrote
- (4) the report that five men were arrested

Whatever the technical processing details in transformational grammar, anyone would recognize a link between (3) and “he wrote the report”. In (4), however, “the report” and the that-clause are not in a relation that would form a sentence.

Here we will call the relation between modifier and head noun found in (1) and (3) the “inner relation” and constructions that do not have that relation, as in (2) and (4) “outer relation”. These two types of relation are found not only with clauses but with verbal modifiers as well.

- (5) a book to read (← someone reads a book)
- (6) a chance to visit with them

As we will see in more detail later, generally in both Japanese and English, there is found a semantic difference such that, whereas the modifying portion in many outer relation constructions is a proposition concerning the content of the head noun, that is not true in the case of inner relations. In addition, nouns that can be modified in an outer relation must have a certain set of semantic characteristics, while for an inner relation, as long as it is substantive and has a certain degree of independence, basically any noun is allowed as head noun.

The second point of view necessary in order to analyze noun modification by a verb or

a structure with a verb at its core is *chinjutsu(sei)* ‘modality’ and *chinjutsudo* ‘the degree of modality’, that is, how strong the modality expressed is. As explained in section 1, in English there is the clear and objective criterion that the combination of a subject noun and a finite verb forms the unit “sentence” and when that forms a part of another sentence, it is called a clause, providing a way to distinguish such from structures formed with infinitives or participles. However, as seen in section 1, while there is the minimal standard that the *chinjutsukei* of a verb, adjective, or copula can be used conclusively (sentence-finally), and thereby form a sentence, it is difficult to find a formal standard to distinguish whether something is a complete sentence or just a verb (phrase) expressing some concept. When a sentence bears a modifying function and is embedded inside another sentence, naturally its independence as a sentence is restricted, but even saying that, probably anyone would find there to be a difference in “sentence-likeness” between the underlined parts of *kare ga itumo densya no naka de yomu hon wa* [he NOM always train GEN inside LOC read book TOP] ‘the book he’s always reading on the train’ and *nanika yomu hon o* [something read book ACC] ‘some book to read’. The latter is so lacking in tense or place it is almost the same as the compound noun *yomimono* ‘reading material’. It is probably the equivalent of an infinitive construction in English.

The concept of *chinjutsudo* ‘degree of modality’ may seem somewhat vague, but when trying to match up the continuum in Japanese from sentence to verb phrase with English clauses and phrases in the same noun modification, it absolutely has to be considered.

Putting the above two points of view into a table with degree of modality as the horizontal dimension and inner versus outer relation as the vertical dimension we get the following.

	Degree of modality high	Degree of modality low or zero
inner relation	[relative clause] the report that he wrote <i>sanma o yaku otoko</i> [saury ACC grill man] ‘the man (who is) grilling saury’	a book to read <i>yomu hon</i> [read book] ‘a book to read’ the crying baby <i>naite.iru ko</i> [cry.GER.be.NONPST baby] ‘the crying baby’
outer relation	[content clause] (“appositive clause” and the like) the report that they were arrested <i>karera ga tukamatta</i> [they NOM be.caught.PST <i>toiu hookoku</i> <i>toiu</i> report] ‘the report that they were arrested’	a chance to visit the possibility of passing the test <i>sinu kakugo</i> [die.NONPST resignation] ‘resigned to one’s death’/‘resignation to death’ <i>ikiru yorokobi</i> [live.NONPST joy] ‘the joy of living’/‘the joy of being alive’

5.2 Inner relation noun modification

a. Relative clauses

One striking difference between English and Japanese that is often pointed out is the presence or absence of relative pronouns (relative words). However, if you compare the following expressions, it is clear that English and Japanese have quite a number of points in common and whether or not there are relative words, a morphological form that carries one role in the make up of the construction, is not such an important factor in essence. (And in actual English usage, the “which” in (10) can be omitted.)

(7) *Kono hitotati ga ano kizi o kaita*
this people NOM that article ACC write.PST

hito desu.
person COP.NONPST

(8) These are the reporters who wrote the story.

(9) *Syuhitu wa karera ga kaita kizi ni*
executive.editor TOP they NOM write.PST article DAT

kyoomi o simesita.
interest ACC show.PST

(10) The executive editor showed interest in the story which they had written.

(11) *Karera ga tukamatta tokoro wa koko da.*
they NOM be.caught.PST place TOP here COP.NONPST

(12) This is the place in which they were arrested.

What all these have in common is the fact that in all of them, the head noun (double underlining) and the modifying part (single underlining) are in a relation in which they could form a sentence – the inner relation. In this sort of noun modification, in order to modify or restrict some noun, from a sentence that includes that noun as a constituent (for example, *kono kisyu ga ano kizi o kaita* [this reporter NOM that article ACC wrote], the noun in question is dropped and the remainder (*ano kizi o kaita*) becomes the modifying part. In this way, since the noun made into the modified noun, that is, the head noun, is also a constituent of the main clause, the formation of such a noun modification structure can also be seen as the combination of two sentences, as shown below.

(13) a. *Kono hitotati wa ano kisyu desu.*
thess people TOP those reporters COP.NONPST

b. *kono kisyu ga ano kizi o kaita.*

these reporters NOM that article ACC write.PST

→ (7)

- (14) a. These are the reporters.
 b. The reporters wrote the story.

→ (8)

What are the conditions necessary for the formation of constructions like (7) – (12)? Many perceptive observations have been made regarding relative clauses (and regarding the comparison of Japanese and English) from a variety of perspectives, particularly the perspective of transformational grammar, and the major topics found are as follows.

When combining two sentences making one a main clause and the other subordinate, (i) the same noun (referring to the same entity) must be in both sentences (the so-called “identity condition”), and in addition, there are the questions of (ii) the case of the noun that is to become the pivot (in English, the noun to be made a relative word), (iii) the degree of modality of the sentence that is to become the modifying clause, and (iv) the internal structure of the sentence that is to become the modifying clause (if composed of multiple clauses, the degree and kind of complexity). In addition, and this also concerns the characteristics of the noun in (i), in English there is the question of distinguishing whether a relative clause is “restrictive” or not. Whether this distinction should be made in Japanese given that there is no surface distinction observable between them is something that must be considered in comparing such expressions in Japanese and English.

There would appear to be no problems with the nouns in (i); as long as they are substantive and independent, any nouns would seem to be fine. However, in the case of Japanese, so-called *keishiki meishi* ‘formal nouns’ like *hazu* ‘expectation’, *tumori* ‘intention’, *mama* ‘(unchanged) condition’, or *koto* ‘matter, fact, act’ are, in fact, problems. We will take up these nouns in part 3 of this section when we consider the kinds of nouns that form outer relation constructions. In English, it should be noted, especially in connection with comparison with Japanese, that relative clauses modifying proper nouns and demonstrative or personal pronouns are usually non-restrictive (naturally enough). We will consider this problem below when we consider restrictive versus non-restrictive.

Regarding point (ii), the case of the noun that is to be made the pivot, Okutsu (1974) and Inoue (1976) are quite detailed, but here we will just look at the problem briefly from the standpoint of comparison between English and Japanese.

For example, if we try combining (15a) and (15b) using *sono mati* as the pivot, just as we combined (13a) and (13b) to form (7), we would get (16).

- (15) a. *Sono* *mati* *wa* *Usuzan* *no* *hunka* *de*
 that town TOP Mt. Usu GEM eruption INS

taihen *datta.*
 terrible.time COP.PST
 ‘The town had a terrible time of it with the eruption of Mt. Usu.’

b. *Sono* *syoonen* *wa* *sono* *mati* *kara*
 that young.man TOP that town FROM

yatte.kita
 come.PST
 ‘That young man came from the town.’

(16) *Sono syoonen ga yatte.kita* (*sono*) *mati* *wa Usuzan no hunka de taihen datta.*

Example (16) is not ungrammatical, but a hearer would not be likely to interpret the relation between the double underlined head noun and the underlined portion as in (15b). Rather, the hearer is most likely to interpret (*sono*) *mati* as *sono mati e* ‘the town the young man came to’. Why might this be? Comparison with English offers an answer. Since in English “the town” in (15b) “from the town” is replaced by “which” yielding “from which”, which is moved to the head of the clause (perhaps leaving “from” behind), the relation between “the town” and the relative clause is clear. However, in the case of Japanese, since the noun *mati* **simply disappears**, the *sono* and the particle *kara* must also disappear. As a result, the hearer ends up having to figure out the relation between the head noun and the relative clause based on his or her inferences concerning the characteristics of the head noun and the relation between it and the characteristics and meaning of the verb. Because the connection between *mati* or any noun referring to a location and verbs like *kuru* ‘come’, *iku* ‘go’, or *kaeru* ‘return’ is such that cases showing a directional *e* or a goal *ni* are favored over or are “more closely connected” than one showing a starting point *kara*, the relation between the head noun and the modifying clause gets interpreted as above.

The question for observation, then, is what particles can accompany a noun that is to be taken out and made the modified noun? This is the same as asking what particles can be omitted without impeding the understanding of the relation between the noun preceding them and the verb of the sentence. Here is a phenomenon that parallels topicalization with *wa*, the adnominalization of a noun (or noun plus particle) by *no* seen in section 3.

One observation that probably fits with all the observations so far is that a noun marked with *ga* [NOM] or *o* [ACC] can always be converted to be a head noun. Example (7) was of *ga* and (8) was of *o*.

One problem that arises here in comparing English and Japanese, is the correspondence of Japanese *o* and English expressions. Japanese *o*, besides showing patient, also shows “source” with verbs like *deru* ‘go out, leave’ and “path” with verbs like *tooru* ‘pass, go along’. Patient or target, like subject, is shown in English by position with respect to the verb. The other meanings are apportioned to prepositions. “Source” is (with the exception of verbs like “leave” that apparently take direct objects) shown by prepositions like “from” or “out of” and

“path” is shown by prepositions like “on”, “through”, or “along”. It is probably natural that, when writing or speaking English, Japanese tend to leave out “from” when expressing (17).

- (17) *watasi ga sotugyoo.sita daigaku*
 I NOM graduate.PST college
 ‘the college from which I was graduated’

As a problem in English composition, this is something that can be said about the conversion to a head noun of all nouns accompanied by particles other than *~ga* or direct-object *o*. For English speakers learning Japanese, from which [N + particle] elements the noun can be converted to become a head noun and from which it cannot is grammatical knowledge that needs to be acquired. For English language education for Japanese, in addition to that, it probably should be investigated with which English prepositions the particles with which one can make the conversion and those one cannot correspond (or when the correspondence is simply with word position). Even with the same particle, there is no single generalization and the nature of the verb must also be taken into consideration.

For example, as seen in (15) and (16), generally the N in an N-*kara* element cannot be converted into a head noun, but there are cases in which one can: *debabootyoo kara ti ga sitataru* [kitchen.knife *kara* blood NOM drip] ‘blood drips from the kitchen knife’ → *ti ga (no) sitataru debabootyoo* [blood NOM (GEN) drip.NONPST kitchen knife] ‘the kitchen knife from which blood drips’ or *minna ga gakuya kara hikiagete simatta* [everyone NOM green.room *kara* withdraw.GER finish.PST] ‘everyone left the green room’ → *minna ga hikiagete simatta gakuya* ‘the green room from which everyone had withdrawn’. In cases like (15) and (16) where it is not possible, often a supplementary, so to speak, [demonstrative + particle] combination like *soko kara* ‘from there’ is inserted into the relative clause, as in the following.

- (18) *Arimanomiko ga doositemo soko kara nogareru*
 Arimanomiko NOM by.all.means **there from** escape.NONPST

koto ga dekinakatta miko o mimatta hiun
 NMLZ NOM be.able.NEG.PST prince ACC visit.PST tragic.fate

no naka ni, Nukata no kokoro o kimyoo.ni
 GEN inside LOC Nukata GEN heart ACC strangely

otitukaseru mono ga atta no dearu.
 calm.CAUS.NONPST thing NOM be.PST GEN COP.NONPST

‘In the tragic fate visited on Arimanomiko, from which he had been completely unable

to escape, Nukata found something that strangely calmed her.’

(INOUE Yasushi *Nukatanoōkimi*)

However, examples like this cannot be said to be common, and, at the least, they are often less than completely natural.

Nouns in “locative” N-*de* or N-*ni*, “endpoint” N-*ni*, “direction, goal” N-*e*, or “means, instrument” N-*de* patterns can generally be converted into head nouns. Accordingly, attention must be paid to the prepositions with which they correspond. We will give just a few real-life examples.

- (19) a small square table and chair at which Emily does her writing
Emirii ga kakimono o suru tiisai sikakui
 Emily NOM writings ACC do, NONPST small square

teeburu to isu
 table and chair
 (W. Luce, *The Belle of Amherst*)

- (20) There are words to which I lift my hat when I see them sitting on a page.
Hon no peezi no ue ni suwatte
 book GEN page GEN above LOC sit.GER

iru no o mite omowazu
 be.NONPST NMLZ ACC see.GER think.NEG.ADV

datuboo.sitaku naru yoo.na kotoba
 remove.hat.DESI.ADV become.NONPST appear.ADN word

ga aru.
 NOM exist.NONPST
 (W. Luce, *The Belle of Amherst*)

- (21) They [black holes] are bottomless pits into which atomic particles, dust and giant suns all disappear without a trace.

Burakku.hooru toiu no wa, gensi mo
 black.holes NMLZ TOP atom also

hokori mo kyodai.na taiyootati mo,
 dust also giant.ADN suns also

zenbu atokatamonaku kieusete iku sokonasi
 all without.a.trace disappear.GER go.NONPST bottomless

no ana da.

GEN hole COP.NONPST

The N in the “result” N-*ni* as in *isya ni naru* [doctor *ni* become] ‘become a doctor’, *aka ni kawaru* [red *ni* change] ‘turn red’, or *itiman.dai ni hueru* [10,000.level *ni* increase] ‘increase to the 10,000 level’ cannot convert. This is pretty much the case in English as well. The N in the related pattern N-*da* [N COP], that is, the nucleus of a nominal predicate, also cannot convert. In English there are cases in which the N of a “be N” pattern can be made a relative pronoun, as in “he still looked like the Princeton undergraduate he once had been” (where the pronoun is elided), but in Japanese, even if it is possible, it ends up having a strong translationese flavor (*kare ga katute soo de.atta (tokoro.no)* ~ [he NOM formerly such COP.PST (which)]).

We made a number of observations about the “N₁ no N₂” pattern in section 3; in some such patterns N₁ can be converted and in some it cannot. (*Syatyoo no okusan ga byooki de nete iru* ‘The company president’s wife is sick in bed.’ → *okusan ga byooki de nete iru syatyoo* ‘the company president whose wife is sick in bed’; *syatyoo no Tanaka-san ga ...* ‘Mr. Tanaka, who is the company president’ →* *Tanaka-san ga ... syatyoo* ‘the company president who Mr. Tanaka ...’; *Sapporo no ani ga tegami o kureta* ‘My older brother in Sapporo sent me a letter.’ →* *ani ga tegami o kureta Sapporo* ‘Sapporo, which my older brother sent me a letter’) In English these are realized by “whose...” or “...of (or “in”, “on” etc.) which”, but this pattern seems comparatively difficult for Japanese.

We will end our consideration of “N + particle” patterns here and turn to (iii), the degree of modality in sentences that may become relative clauses.

The following examples show that, even should two sentences meet the identity condition and fulfill the conditions concerning case just considered, that may not be sufficient for them to be able to form a relative clause construction.

- (22) *Kore* *ga* *sono* *kamera* *da.* (main clause)
 this NOM that camera COP.NONPST
 ‘This is the camera.’

- (23) a. *Watasi* *wa* *kinoo* *kono* *kamera* *o* *kaimasita.*
 I TOP yesterday this camera ACC buy.POL.PST
 ‘I bought this camera yesterday.’
- b. *Kono* *kamera* *o* *kainasai.*
 this camers ACC buy.IMP
 ‘Buy this camers!’
- c. *Kono* *kamera* *wa* *ii.desu* *ka.*
 this camera TOP good.POL.NONPST Q
 ‘Is this camera good?’
- d. *Kono* *kamera* *o* *kaimasyoo* *yo.*
 this camera ACC buy.POL.VOL SFP

‘Let’s buy this camera.’

If we try to form a relative clause construction with (22) as the main clause, none of (23 b, c, d) will work. This may appear to be a matter of course, but it shows that there are important structural (and universal) constraints with regard to modality on what can be made into a relative clause, or more generally, into a subordinate clause. In Japanese (23b – d) can only be used to modify a noun (such as *yookyuu* ‘demand’, *situmon* ‘question’, or *sasoi* ‘invitation’) by embedding them to the quotative form *toiu*. We will consider this pattern in subsection 5.3. Forms such as these never appear in relative clauses. Even in the case of a declarative sentence, as in the case of (23a), in forming a relative clause normally *watasi wa* [I TOP] would have to change to *watasi ga* [I NOM] and *kaimasita* [buy.POL.PST] to *katta* [buy.PST] showing that politeness and topicalization are more in the province of *chinjutsu* or mood than part of the propositional content. As has been pointed out before, *~wa* can only appear in a relative clause with a contrastive interpretation, as for example in *Gyaku.ni, nensyuu wa hikui Rondon no sitentyoo wa zeikin 90-man-en* [conversely annual.income *wa* low London GEN branch.office.manager TOP tax 900,000-yen] ‘Conversely, the tax on the branch office manager in London, where the salary is low, is 900,000-yen’ (Asahi Shinbun). So-called “tense in relative clauses” has been a frequent topic in the past, but it is probably more accurate to understand this in relation to mood. There are many interesting facts concerning this that emerge in Japanese-English comparison, but we do not have the space to go into them here.

One factor that has been elucidated as a constraint of English relativization is the type and degree of the complexity of the structure in which it is embedded, and it has been observed that Japanese is much more flexible in this regard. Kuno, Okutsu, and Inoue have made detailed studies of this question and we will not go into it here.

The last matter to consider regarding relative clauses is the question of “restrictive” versus “non-restrictive”.

In general Japanese are not as sensitive to the distinction between “restrictive” and “non-restrictive” modification as English speakers are. It is pretty much the same case as with the modification by “N + *no*” examined in section 3 or the modification by an adjective in section 4, but does anyone ever ask, ‘Which meaning is that,’ when they hear *kayowai zyosei* ‘frail woman’? In the Taishō period (1912-1926) here were two *rakugo* comedians named “Kingentei Bashō”, one in Tokyo (in eastern Japan) and one in Osaka (in western Japan) and at that time, if one were to say *higasi no Basyoo* [east *no* Bashō], it would probably be taken as restrictive. However, if one were to say *higasi no Basyoo* [east *no* Bashō] or *nisi no Basyoo* [west *no* Bashō] at a meeting of Famous Persons from the East and West, for example, it would probably be interpreted as non-restrictive.

It makes sense that a clause with a proper noun as its head noun should generally be non-restrictive (granted, however, that it may be restrictive if there are more than one proper noun objects with the same name, as in “a James McCord listed in Washington or its suburbs”). Therefore, in English, such cases are represented as “₂ ... who/which ...₂” but in Japanese the commas are often forgotten (Makishita (1972) shows this providing a number of actual examples from compositions), but what is striking is that proper nouns are quite often modified by relative

clauses in Japanese.

- (24) *oisogasii* *anata* *ni* *konna* *koto* *o*
 busy.NONPST you DAT this.kind.of thing ACC
- onegai.suru* *no* *wa* *moosiwake.nai* *n*
 request.NONPST NMLZ TOP inexcusable.NONPST NMLZ
- desu* *ga,*
 COP.NONPST but
 ‘I am sorry to ask this of you, who are so busy, but ...’

Any number of such expressions can be gleaned from literary works, and in their English translations some, like (25, 26) are clauses just as described above, while others like (27, 28) sometimes use a variety of conjunctions to link the clauses.

- (25) *Dare* *kara* *mo* *hontoo.ni* *aisarete*
 who from even true.ADVL love.PASS.GER
- inai* *toiu* *sinnen* *o* *motenai*
 be.NEG.NONPST belief ACC hold.POTEN.NEG.NONPST
- Kensaku wa,* *wazuka.na* *kioku* *o* *tadotte,*
 Kensaku TOP faint.ADN memory ACC trace.GER
- yahari* *naki* *haha* *o* *sitatte* *ita.*
 after.all deceased mother ACC pine.for.GER be.PST
 (SHIGA Naoya, *An'ya Kōro*)

- (26) Kensaku, who could not believe that anyone truly loved him, cherished all such memories of his dead mother ...
 (Translator: E. McClellan)

- (27) *Gakkoo* *o* *sotugyoo.suru* *no* *o* *hutu* *no*
 school ACC graduate.NONPST NMLZ ACC normal GEN
- ningen* *tosite* *toozen* *no* *yoo.ni* *kangaete*
 person as natural GEN appear.ADVL think.GER
- ita* *watasi* *wa,* *sore* *o* *yoki* *izyoo.ni*
 be.PST I TOP that ACC expectation greater.ADVL
- yorokonde* *kureru* *titi* *no* *mae*
 be.pleased.GER give.me.NONPST father GEN before

ni *kyoosyuku.sita.*
 LOC be.grateful.PST
 (NATSUME Sōseki, *Kokoro*)

- (28) I had come to regard a university education as commonplace, and I was touched by my father's unexpected pleasure at my graduation.
 (Translator: E. McClellan)

When one considers the general psychology of the speaker using non-restrictive relative clauses in both Japanese and English, this use is interesting in showing one part of the special characteristics of Japanese.

When we look at cases in which a relative clause is used non-restrictively in English, especially cases in which the antecedent is a noun referring to definite object, we can see that the content expressed as an explanatory aside is something that the speaker sees as some sort of special relevance to the content of the main clause and that relevance is something the speaker wants to signal to the hearer. That psychology is the same in Japanese. For example, the relative clause modifying Kensaku in (25) or that modifying *watasi* 'I' in (27) express meanings that could be restated using *node* 'since'. In other cases, the content may be paraphrasable using ... *daga* [COP.but] 'although...' or ...*noni* 'in spite of the fact that...'. However, I think it is the essence of relative clauses that they do not make such a clear declaration of the relation between the clause and the head noun. The speaker expresses an evaluation of the proposition or statement in the main clause with the facts or situation shown by the relative clause as background information and leaves the connection between them to the hearer – this can be thought of as the psychology behind the speaker's using a relative construction in its non-restrictive use. Of course, there are many cases where there is no such implication and the clause simply adds additional information. However, this use could be seen as similar to the use of *~site* 'do.GER ...' or *~sinagara* 'while doing ...', which usually show additive conjunction, to sometimes show a reason or contrastive conjunction. Since Thompson (1971) there have been many grammarians who have looked at the relation between non-restrictive relative clauses and conjunction with "and", and, from the point of view of the psychology behind the expression, I think this is an acceptable direction in which to go. (However, that does not mean that I necessarily agree with a description of the construction as having been "generated" from some sort of conjoined structure.) This approach of avoiding the direct expression of the relation between two events or states but leaving it up to the hearer to make a connection is, of course, also found in English, but it is often cited as a general characteristic of Japanese. The fact that Japanese seems fond of nonrestrictive relative clause constructions can be seen to be one expression of this general tendency.

b. Modification by other verbal expressions or by verbs low in modality

In this subsection, we will consider participles and infinitives in English that modify nouns in an inner relation and the case of verbs in Japanese that, while appearing in *chinjutsukei* forms, are low in modality and convey only their conceptual meaning while modifying nouns in an inner relation. At the end of the subsection we will briefly consider verbal nouns in English and non-*chinjutsukei* forms of verbs modifying nouns in Japanese.

Let us first examine English present participles followed by a look at past participles. Present participles can modify either a following or a preceding noun, but since they must generally be adjacent to the noun, if they are accompanied by a prepositional phrase or a direct object noun, they must follow the noun they modify.

- (29) the crying baby
- (30) the student reading a newspaper
- (31) *the reading the newspaper student
- (32) *the crying in her arms baby

When the participle comes before the noun, an adverb can only appear before the participle.

- (33) *the crying bitterly baby

The formal constraints given above are known to everyone, but let us take a look at the semantic side of these restrictions.

It is natural to view this sort of adnominal modification by a participle as being a reduced form from a relative clause (deletion of relative word + be – ‘whiz deletion’).

- (34) a. the baby who is crying → (29)
- b. the student who is reading a newspaper → (30)

Among the participle + noun examples, there are some like “a bus going to Chicago” ← “a bus which goes to Chicago” or “the relation existing between ...” ← “the relation which exists between ...” that appear to come from a “relative word + present tense form of verb”, but on the whole, it doesn’t seem too far off to regard modification by a present participle as resulting from the deletion of the “be” of the present progressive together with a relative word. In other words, the restriction made by a modifying participle is a restriction that includes the meaning of the action, operation, or situation expressed by (the stem of) the participle now occurring on its subject noun, where the meaning of “now” is based on the tense of the main clause. In section 4 earlier, we saw the two types of restriction proposed by Bolinger for the “be + adjective” pattern, “characteristic” versus “occasion”, but concerning the case of modification by a participle, the “occasion” quality appears strong.

The “-ing” form of a transitive verb, particularly of a transitive verbs expressing feelings (like “amuse”, “surprise”, or “charm”) is an adjectivized form of general modification by a participle. Accordingly, they are of the “characteristic” type and can take degree adverbs like “very”.

As is clear from the link above with relative clauses, noun modification by a present

participle is an inner relation modification relation, in fact, more limitedly, a modifying relation in which the head noun is always the subject of the action, etc. expressed by the verb. For example, Japanese *ima kowasite iru ie* [now raze.GER be.NONPST house] ‘the house (someone) is tearing down now’ cannot be realized as “the house tearing down now”. The object-verb relation must be expressed in the form of the past participle. This is one of the differences with the modification by an infinitive that we will look at later.

Next is the case of modification by a past participle. These are almost all the past participles of transitive verbs and all include some passive meaning. The past participles of intransitive verbs all have a clear perfective meaning, as in “the fallen idol”, “the departed poet”, or “the deceased father”. However, modification with the past participle of an intransitive verb is limited and not productive (“*the died father”, “*the cried baby”). Just as there are adjectivized present participles, so too are there adjectivized past participles, as in “a social isolate *possessed* of disordered impulses and mentally isolated from reality” “handicapped children”, or “a well-known poet. (But they are not always compatible with degree adverbs.)

As seen above, the pattern of a participle modifying a noun in an inner relation can be seen as a reduced relative clause, so to speak, but the fact should not be overlooked that it also differs in many ways from relative clauses in that it is tenseless (semantically agreeing with the tense of the main clause) and that the head noun is always semantically the subject of the participle; in short it is, in the terms of this chapter, a modifying form very low in modality.

The similarity with relative clauses can also be seen in the fact there are both restrictive and non-restrictive uses. All the examples we have looked at so far have been restrictive uses, but the following are an example each of non-restrictive uses of present and past participles.

- (35) Their married daughter, now living in Tottori, was staying there with their baby.
(E. McClellan’s translation of (36))

- (36) *Tottori e yomeitta tera no musume ga*
Tottori to marry.into.PST temple GEN daughter NOM

akago o turete.kite ita
baby ACC bring.GER be.PST

- (37) [Hearing the response “anti-communist” to the question of his occupation]
The Judge, accustomed to hearing unconventional job description, nonetheless appeared perplexed.
(Bernstein and Woodward, *All the President’s Men*)

Next, we will consider infinitives. A paraphrase with a relative clause is possible when forming an inner relation noun modification with an infinitive, also. Examples (40) and (41) appear in the same work, quite close to each other, and are examples of the two forms being differentiated in use.

- (38) a book for you to read --- a book which you (should) read
 (39) Father was the only one in the house to say “damn.”
 (W. Luce, *The Belle in Amherst*)

→ ...the only one who could say “damn.”

- (40)) Now, there’s a word to lift your hat to.
 (W. Luce, *The Belle in Amherst*)
 (41)) There are words to which I lift my hat when I see them sitting on a page.
 (W. Luce, *The Belle in Amherst*)

However, as in the case of participles, saying that they can be restated as relative clauses does not necessarily mean that they have the same meaning. The fact that, like participles, infinitives are tenseless is important, as the fact that they are both without modality and that they are conceptual, but it is also important to consider the points on which infinitives differ from participles.

The first point on which they differ structurally is that they always follow the noun they modify. In addition, their relation to the head noun is freer. By freer, we mean that in a “N to V” pattern the head noun, N, is not limited to corresponding to the subject of the verb, V, but can also be an object or even the object of a preposition that follows the verb; in fact, it can carry pretty much any relation that a noun phrase in a sentence can carry. The fact that, as in “the important thing to do/to be done” both active and passive forms are possible can be explained as due to this fact.

Jespersen called cases in which the head noun was like the object of the infinitive or of a preposition, as in (38), (40), or (42), “retroactive infinitives” and cases like (39) or (43) in which the head noun is the subject of the infinitive “non-retroactive infinitives”.

- (42) a. I have something to do.
 b. There was no chair to sit on.
 (43) She isn’t a girl to say such a thing.

As to whether or not there is a meaning difference between infinitives and participles, that is quite difficult to say and, as we will see below, Japanese often have a problem deciding which to use, but modification by an infinitive can be said to, unlike that by a participle where there is always the meaning that the modified noun is currently in the midst of the action or situation described, be capable of being taken as indicating an event that is unrealized but which is possible or necessary (often corresponding to ~*subeki* ‘ought to’ in Japanese) and shows a noun that fits that unrealized circumstance. Ogawa (1954)) says that the use in (43) and (38)) is the oldest (examples in the OED are from the 800s) and that other uses derived from that so the original meaning of (42) would have been “I have a certain thing ‘in an ought-to-do direction’ from now” and this sort of infinitive is what showed the original objective.

Above we looked at English participle and infinitive constructions, but now we turn our attention to Japanese.

As has been repeated several times, in Japanese nouns referring to some concrete events are accompanied by various particles that show the relation to the verb and express some propositional content with the predicate verb as the core, but when clear from the context or the situation, they can be omitted. Accordingly, other than whether a predicate is in a *chinjutsukei* form, there is no external indication of whether an utterance ending in a verb, or an adjective (or a noun + *da*) constitutes a clause or not.

However, even only considering Japanese, that is, even if we put aside consideration of the need to compare with English or other languages, discriminating whether or not an utterance ending in a *chinjutsukei*, especially a present or past tense form, is “complete”, that is, forms a sentence that makes a proposition in a coherent form expressing a concrete event, is in fact a distinction that we intuitively make. The criteria we use are, first whether or not we recognize the present tense or past tense forms to actually express “tense”, and second whether we are conscious of the utterance expressing that “someone (or something)” did such and such. This applies to independent utterances as well. For example, in (44) and (45), probably no one would interpret the present tense forms as expressing present (as opposed to past) tense. In (45), who does the slicing is totally out of our consciousness; that is, it is an example of the second criterion above.

- (44) *Bukka wa agaru, rootin wa takaku*
 prices TOP rise.NONPST wages TOP high.ADVL
naru, de Okinawa wa Kaiyoohaku de
 become.NONPST INS Okimawa TOP Expo’75 INS
taihen desu yo.
 trouble COP.NONPST SFP
 ‘Prices go up, wages get higher, Okinawa has troubles with Expo ‘75’
- (45) *Daikon wa wagiri ni simasu.*
 daikon TOP cross-slice DAT do.NONPST
 ‘Cut the daikon into flat, round slices.’

We can also consider these facts in regard to the modification of nouns by verbs that is our current focus.

For example, in examples like *danti e iku basu* ‘the bus (that goes) to the housing development’ or *niku o kiru hootyoo* ‘a knife that cuts meat’, there is no consciousness of a present or future (as opposed to a past) in which someone goes somewhere or cuts something. In that sense, they have something in common with the English verbal expressions (participles and infinitives) that we looked at earlier. However, over and above abstracting the conceptual content of the verb, in other words, discarding the concrete propositionality of subject and tense, there is

no consciousness in Japanese of making a choice between modification by a participle or by an infinitive and so it is difficult for Japanese to decide which to use to translate the Japanese forms above into English.

As for examples in which the past form does not indicate past tense, the following words come to kind.

- (46) *hutotta/yaseta hito* [gain.weight.PST/lose.weight.PST person] ‘a fat/thin person’,
magatta miti/kugi [bend.PST road/nail] ‘a curved road/a bent nail’, *sugureta sakuhin*
 [be.superior.PST work] ‘a superior work’, *bakageta kuusoo* [be.foolish.PST fantasy] ‘a
 foolish fantasy’, *otituita taido* [become.calm.PST attitude] ‘a calm attitude’, *megane o
 kaketa otoko* [glasses ACC wear.PST man] ‘a man wearing glasses’

All of these that fall into the fourth category in Kindaichi’s (1953) categorization of verbs into stative, durative, instantaneous, and “those that project a state”, which normally appear in the *~te iru* form at the end of a sentence and in the *~ta* form when used to modify a noun. The distinction between these and instantaneous verbs is sometimes subtle, but generally speaking no past tense meaning or perfective meaning is found when these “type 4” verbs are used in the *~ta* form to modify a noun. Comparing these to English, they resemble English past participles (especially the past participles of intransitive verbs) used adnominally. In particular, it could be said that, among the participles, they resemble the “ing” forms of transitive verbs of feeling (like “amazing” or “interesting”), which could be termed adjectives.

There are many other observations to be made regarding noun modification by verbs and adjectives of low modality, or no modality at all, but we will leave our observations at this point.

As non-modal forms modifying nouns, there are forms like *syakkin o ku ni site no ikka.sinzyuu* [debts ACC suffering DAT make.GER GEN family.suicide] ‘a family suicide because of suffering over debts’ or *kore ga seikoo.sureba no hanasi da ga* [this NOM succeed.PROV GEN talk COP.NONPST but] ‘this all provided it succeeds, but’, however there isn’t much to be said about these here. Also, since I do not have any material concerning English verbal nouns that would particularly expand on what has been said about them before, I will end this subsection here.

5.3 Outer relation noun modification

a. Content clauses (Appositive clauses)

In the previous section, we looked at noun modification constructions in which the head noun is in a relation such that it semantically bears some sort of case relation with the (verb that forms the core of the) modifying clause; in other words, the head noun and the modifying clause together form a single sentence. Here we will look at noun modifications in which the head noun and the modifying clause are not in such an “inner relation”, looking first at constructions in which the modifying portion is a sentence or a form close to a sentence with content (modality) and then gradually work our way to constructions in which the level of

modality is low.

Regardless of whether the structure or content of the modifying portion is simple or complex, in this sort of noun modification with the “outer relation”, the modifying portions all bear the role of explicating the content of the head noun. As stated before, this is a striking semantic difference from the case of the inner relation.

The formation of an outer relation noun modification construction depends more than anything on the semantic characteristics of the head noun. Accordingly, in the classification of these constructions, we first look at the categorization by the semantic characteristics of the head nouns, and then, as was done in the preceding section, look at the internal structure of the modifying clause. While pursuing these two avenues, we will also bring in occasional comparisons between Japanese and English.

As an outer relation noun modification structure close to a sentence, the first thing that comes to mind is the English appositive that-clause. However, in order to make a comparison with Japanese, we must broaden our scope a bit and look at all constructions that take the form of a sentence and explicate the content of the head noun.

The pattern closest to a sentence in form or that is actually a sentence that is inserted into another sentence in Japanese is, of course, a “quotation”. Since the functions of the Japanese “*to*” encompass both the English direct quotation and the “that” of indirect quotation, let us begin by considering the verbs in Japanese that take “...*to*” as an argument and their associated nominal forms.

Verbs that take “...*to*” (or English “that-clauses”) can be broadly divided between verbs of speech, like *iu* ‘say’, and verbs of thinking or sensation like *omou* ‘think’. Let us collect the nouns that correspond to these types.

- (47) *iu*-type ↔ speech nouns
kotoba ‘words, language’, *monku* ‘phrase, complaint’, *huhei* ‘complaint’, *tegami* ‘letter’, *denpoo* ‘telegram’, *henzi* ‘reply, answer’, *mooside* ‘application’, *sasoi* ‘invitation’, *meirei* ‘order, command’, *yookyuu* ‘demand, request’, *uwasa* ‘rumor’, *syutyoo* ‘claim, statement’, ...
- (48) *omou*-type ↔ nouns of thought or perception
omoi ‘thought, memory’, *kangae* ‘thought, idea’, *soozoo* ‘imagination’, *iken* ‘opinion’, *zentei* ‘premise’, *sinnen* ‘belief’, *utagai* ‘doubt’, *zyasui* ‘(unjust) suspicion’, *~kan* ‘~view’, *ki* ‘feeling, sense’, *kimoti* ‘feeling, emotion’, ...

These are all nouns that can express their content in the form of a sentence and that can take that sentence as a modifier, but the nouns in (47) differ slightly from those in (48) in that they all require *toiu* ‘(lit) QUOT.say’ between the head noun and the modifying part. In English, as we will see in examples later, a direct quotation in quotation marks cannot modify a noun and neither an imperative sentence nor an interrogative sentence can modify a noun in the form of an indirect quotation with the “that” that shows the reported portion, but in Japanese, if *toiu*

intervenes, any kind of sentence can be used to modify a noun.

- (49) *Watasi o yobiyoseta tomodati wa, kyuuni*
 I ACC summon.PST friend TOP suddenly
kunimoto kara kaere toiu denpoo o
 home from come.home.IMP telegram ACC
uketotta.
 receive.PST
 ‘The friend who had called me had suddenly received a telegram from home saying,
 “Come home!”’
 (NATSUME Sōseki, *Kokoro*)

The group of nouns in (48), given their meanings, naturally usually express as their contents clear volition, judgments, or surmises and in such cases they require *toiu*. However, in some cases, the content is a simple proposition and in such cases the modifying portion can immediately precede the head noun without the intervention of *toiu*. Compare (50) with (51) and (52) with (53).

- (50) *Watasi o yakihorobosu hi wa Kinkakuzi*
 I ACC burn.up.NONPST fire TOP Kinkakuji
omo yakihorobosu daroo toiu kangae wa,
 ACC.also burn.up.NONPST COP.PRES idea TOP
watasi o hotondo yowaseta
 I ACC almost become.drunk.CAUS.PST
no de.aru.
 NMLZ COP.NONPST
 ‘The thought that the fire that consumed me would probably also consume the Golden Pavilion made me feel almost intoxicated.’
 (MISHIMA Yukio, *Kinkakuji*)
- (51) *Tizisen ni deru kangae wa*
 governor’s.race in enter.NONPST idea TOP
motte inai.
 have.GER be.NEG.NONPST
 ‘I have no thought of entering the race for governor.’
- (52) “*Nandemo koi*” *toiu ki ni nari,...*
 anything come.IMP feeling DAT become.ADV
 ‘I was feeling like, “bring it on”, and ...’

- (53) *Zibun wa nezumi no saigo o miru ki*
 self TOP rat GEN last ACC watch.NONPST feeling
ga sinakatta.
 NOM do.NEG.PST
 ‘I didn’t feel like watching the end of the rat.’
 (SHIGA Naoya, *Shiro no Saki nite*)

There is a group of nouns like *zizitu* ‘fact, reality’ or *kanoosei* ‘possibility’, approaching those of (48) that, while not tied to any verbs of speech or thought, can show their content in the form of a sentence. More than the nouns in (48), the nouns in this group often take content that is simply a proposition, a statement of some facts without the speaker’s subjective attitude being expressed, and the more the content fits this description, the less the degree to which *toiu* is called for. Let us call this type of noun “fact nouns” and demonstrate them with some real-life examples.

- (54) “fact” nouns
koto ‘fact, matter’, *zizitu* ‘fact, reality’, *ziken* ‘incident’, *hanasi* ‘tale, story’, *sawagi* ‘disturbance’, *kekka* ‘result, outcome’, *yume* ‘dream’, *kioku* ‘memory’, *katei* ‘process’, *kudari* ‘passage, paragraph’, *kanoosei* ‘possibility’, *koosan* ‘public expectation’, *osore* ‘fear, worry’, *kikensei* ‘danger’, *sigoto* ‘job’, *syoobai* ‘trade, occupation’, ...

- (55) *Nanpoo.bunka.yooso to kangaerareru mono ga,*
 elements.of.southern.culture QUOT think.PASS.NONPST thinga NOM
waga kodai.nookoo.bunka ni huhen.teki.ni
 our ancient.agriculture.culture to universally
tomonatte iru zizitu
 accompany.GER be.NONPST fact
 ‘the fact that elements thought to be from cultures to the south universally accompany the ancient agricultural culture in Japan,’
 (HIGUCHI Hiroyuki, *Nihon Kodai Sangyōshi*)

- (56) *Kare no kokoro ni, ima no zibun o*
 he GEN heart LOC now GEN self ACC
nagusameru mono ga, Amerika.zin no
 console.NONPST person NOM American GEN
sen'yuu dewa.naku. Okinawa.zin no
 wartime.buddy COP.NEG,ADVL Okinawan GEN
itikazoku dearu toiu zizitu ga
 one.family COP.NONPST fact NOM

kanasii *mono* *ni* *omowareta.*
 sad.NONPST thing DAT think.PASS.PST
 ‘He felt in his heart the sad fact that it would not be his American wartime friends
 who would console him now but an Okinawan family.’
 (ŌSHIRO Tatsuhiro, *Nisei*)

- (57) *Tyuugoku ga* *Nisi-Doku* *no* *kakugizyutu*
 China NOM West.Germany GEN nuclear.technology
- doonyuu* *o* *hakaruru* *kanoosei* *ga*
 introduction ACC plan.NONPST possibility NOM
- aru.*
 exist.NONPST
 ‘There is a possibility that China will attempt to bring in West German nuclear
 technology.’
 (*Asahi Shinbun*)

The noun *kekka* ‘result’ has the kind of use described here, but it also one of the few nouns that also have the “relative” modification use that will be described later along with examples of both uses.

Let us set Japanese aside here and turn to comparison with English.

First, looking at correspondences with the speech nouns in (47), we see that English has two sets of corresponding nouns based on their structural properties. One group requires the intervention of “that”, just as Japanese required *toiu*, and the other group does not allow *that* to appear. Let us tentatively call the latter group “direct speech” nouns and the former group “indirect speech” nouns.

- (58) Nouns related to direct speech
 letter, telegram, proverb, word, ...
- (59) Nouns related to indirect speech
 story, talk, claim, charge, contention, prediction, denial, ...

When adding a clause to express the content of the nouns in (58), generally a direct “that-clause” is not used but instead forms like the following are used.

a letter saying that ...
 in which he wrote (that) ...
 requesting (that) ...
 inquiring ...

For example, E. McClellan’s translation of (49) is as follows.

(60) ... my friend received a telegram from home demanding his return

In contrast, the nouns in (59) can be modified by a direct “that-clause” (appositive clause).

(61) Carter said he was undisturbed by the talk that his style was confusing,
(*Time*, 1978)

(62) Defense Secretary Melvin Laird turned up the pressure another notch with a prediction that present levels of the Soviet arms build up would put the Soviet Union “ahead of the U.S. in all areas” by the mid-1970s.

(*Newsweek*, 1969)

For Japanese, verbs of thought and nouns related to them were given in (48) and those in English corresponding to them would be those in (63)). However, there does not appear to be anything to differentiate them in terms of their syntactic behavior from the indirect speech nouns of (59).

(63) Thought nouns
idea, mood, thinking, thought, belief, conviction, suspicion, doubt, understanding,
opinion, notion, fear, impression, ...

Here are two real life examples.

(64) There is a mounting mood in Washington that the Carter presidency may be fundamentally flawed and that ...
(*Time*, 1978)

(65) Beckley said he came here last September with the understanding that he would receive an assistant professorship (= *toiu ryookai de*)
(*Kansan*, 1969)

The group of nouns in (66) can be thought of as an extension of those in (63).

(66) “fact” nouns
fact, possibility, chance, exception, reason, effect, result, ...

The nouns in (66) are generally given in English grammar books as examples of nouns that take an ordinary appositive “that-clause” and syntactically as well, they are generally the same as those in (63), but, whereas those of the type in (63) almost always take a that clause for the part that modifies them explicating their content, I think the fact that those in (66)) often take prepositional phrases like “of~”, “to~”, or “for~” or infinitives reflects a semantic difference between them (we will touch on this again in the section on modification by phrases). “Exception” and “result” normally take the pattern “with the exception/result that ...”. “Effect” can also take a “that-clause” in the pattern “to the effect that ...”. Here is such an example.

- (67) “What will she swear to?”
“Heaven knows,” Mason said, “but it will probably be to the effect that she saw Eleanor Corvin with that gun in her possession within a few hours of the time of the murder.”
(E. S. Gardner, *The Case of the Glamorous Ghost*)

b. From appositive clauses to appositive phrases – The thinning of the modality of the modifying part.

As is clear from the observations above, a deep mutual relation can be seen between the semantic characteristics of the head noun and the internal structure of the part that modifies it in an outer relation.

The closer the modifying part is to being an independent sentence, the more necessary the use of *toiu* ‘that’ to connect the modifying part and the head noun. Conversely, as we will see below, the phenomenon is observable that, when the modifying part is clearly lacking modality, use of *toiu* is not allowed in Japanese, and in English, rather than a “that-clause”, the modifying part takes the form of an infinitive or a prepositional phrase. In both Japanese and English, there is a middle range between the two extremes. We already observed that “that-clauses”, infinitives, and prepositional phrases are all found with the English nouns in (66). Of course, the commonalities observed between Japanese and English are commonalities in principle and words that may seem similar in terms of their lexical meaning may not always show the same syntactic behavior. Below we will subcategorize these constructions going from those that take higher modality appositive clauses to those that take lower modality forms and compare Japanese and English. Since the subcategorizations are based on the characteristics of each language we will not propose a universal set of categories for both languages.

(i) Cases in which “fact” nouns in English are modified by prepositional phrases

The first example is of “possibility”, a noun from the group in (66), which can take either a “that-clause” or a prepositional phrase.

- (68) Bernstein asked if he thought there was any possibility that the President’s campaign committee or – less likely – the White House would sponsor such a stupid mission as the Watergate raid.
(Bernstein and Woodward, *All the President’s Men*)
- (69) Speaking of the possibility of the nation-wide campus riots being a conspiracy, Cronkite said, ...
(*Kansan*, 1970)
- (70) This is confirmed by the possibility of having two negatives at once.
(E. Bach, *Syntactic Theory*)

The appositive modifying part of (68) is a clause high in modality (subject, tensed finite verb), (70) is an example in which the subject is not in question (being apparent from the previous

context) with a non-tensed verbal noun, and (69) is midway between them (the verb is untensed – assimilated to that of the main clause – but the subject appears as the “semantic subject”). These three examples can be said to show that the degree of modality discussed earlier is a characteristic that shows a continuum.

“Thought” belongs to the group in (63), but it also takes prepositional phrases, sometimes with the logical subject expressed.

(71) the thought of matter going down a kind of cosmic drain stretches the mind
(*Time*, 1978)

(72) Kensaku could not bear the thought of spending the night thus.
(SHIGA Naoya, *An 'ya Kōro*)

(ii) Nouns relating to perception and their content

There are syntactic differences observable between verbs of thought or conception and verbs of perception, and in their respective nominal forms, there are differences between the nouns of thought in (63) and (66) and other nouns expressing abstract concepts and nouns like those below in both English and Japanese in terms of the internal structure of the modifying parts expressing their content.

(73) Nouns expressing perception – Japanese
sugata ‘figure’, *katati* ‘shape’, *iro* ‘color’, *oto* ‘sound’, *nioi* ‘smell, odor’, *azi* ‘flavor’, *kansyoku* ‘feeling, sensation’, *kanzi* ‘feeling, sense’, *kehai* ‘feeling, indication’, *e* ‘picture, drawing’, *syasin* ‘photograph’, *kookei* ‘scene, view’, *sama* ‘manner, look’, ...

(74) Nouns expressing perception – English
sight, sound, noise, smell, feel, feeling, touch; picture, photograph, scene, ...

The modifying part showing the content of the nouns in (73) are generally of the form “~*ga* ... *suru/site-iru/sita* [~NOM does/is.doing/did ...] and they do not allow *toi* between the modifying clause (in Japanese) and the head noun. This is different from the nouns of thought and the “fact” nouns.

(75)

<i>Kyuuzyo.tati</i>		<i>ga</i>	<i>muragatte</i>	<i>mizu</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>kumi,</i>
servant.women		NOM	gather.GER	water	ACC	scoop.up.ADVL
<i>nuno</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>aratte</i>	<i>ita</i>	<i>sugata</i>	<i>mo</i>	
cloth	ACC	wash.GER	be.PST	figure	also	
<i>e</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>yoo.ni</i>	<i>soozoo.dekiru.</i>			
picture	GEN	like	imagine.POTEN.NONPST			

‘One can imagine as if in a picture the image of the servant women gathering to draw water and wash the clothes.
(OSARAGI Jirō, *Asuka no Haru*)

- (76) *Ki no eda ga reiki de*
 tree GEN branches NOM cold.air INS
oreru oto da
 break.NONPST sound COP.NONPST
 ‘It is the sound of tree branches breaking in the cold air.’

The *ga* marking the subject (nominative-marked complement) noun in the *~ga ... suru* patterns sometimes becomes *~no* [~ GEN]. Sometimes pattern takes the form *...suru ~ no N* [do ... ~ GEN N]. In either case, the *... suru* part can be said to have the quality of a modifying word making the linking of *~ no sugata/oto/e* [~ GEN figure/sound/picture] more detailed.

(Translator’s note: Taking (76) as a base, the first pattern described in this paragraph would be *Ki no eda no reiki de oreru oto da* [tree GEN branches GEN cold.air INS break.NONPST sound COP.NONPST]. The second pattern described would be *reiki de oreru ki no eda no oto da* [cold.air INS break,NONPST tree GEN branch GEN sound COP.NONPST].)

A characteristic of the English nouns in (74) is that they do not take “that-clauses” but take a content-describing modification pattern of “of ~ ing”.

- (77) “We heard noises upstairs like pool tables being turned over and glass breaking,” one band member said.
 (Newspaper)
- (78) The sight of this withered old priest, crying with joy, welling up from deep in his heart, made all idea of killing him as an enemy unthinkable.
 (KIKUCHI Hiroshi, *Onshū no Kanata ni*, translation by John Bester. Quoted in Isshiki (1968))

Nouns like English “picture”, “manner”, and “scene” also often take relative clauses of the form “in which”, in addition to the “of ~” pattern.

- (iii) “Semi-predicational nouns”: Nouns that take content-describing modification forms without subjects

There is a group of nouns in both Japanese and English that take modifiers describing their content in which subject nouns normally do not appear. While not the same as English, the presence of a subject (nominative-marked complement) noun, together with sentence-final tense marking, appears to be the minimal sign that an utterance is relating a concrete event. We have already seen that among the present tense verb forms there are those that do not express tense, that is, forms that only express the conceptual content of the verb, and, just like the fact that they can only take such verb forms, the fact that they cannot take subject nouns shows the small capacity, so to speak, of this set of nouns as heads.

Consider, for example, nouns like *kuse* ‘(negative) habit’, *yakusoku* ‘promise’, and

kiryoku ‘spirit’. They can, of course, appear in an inner relation noun modification construction like *zibun ga kizukanai kuse* [self.NOM notice.NEG.NONPST habit] ‘a habit one doesn’t notice’ or *hen.na kuse* [strange.ADN habit] ‘a strange habit’, but they can also take modification with an outer relation showing the content of the head nouns. Such constructions are like the example below.

- (79)
- | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| <i>Kono</i>
this | <i>otoko</i>
man | <i>wa,</i>
TOP | <i>hoka.nimo</i>
additionally | <i>mada</i>
still | <i>myoo.na</i>
odd.ADN | | | |
| <i>kuse</i>
habits | <i>ga</i>
NOM | <i>aru.</i>
exist.NONPst | <i>Zibun</i>
self | <i>no</i>
GEN | <i>motte</i>
have.GER | | | |
| <i>iru</i>
be.NONPST | | <i>zeni</i>
money | <i>o,</i>
ACC | <i>hito</i>
person | <i>no</i>
GEN | <i>siranai</i>
know.NEG.NONPST | | |
| <i>aida.ni</i>
span | <i>isigake</i>
stone.wall | | <i>no</i>
GEN | <i>ana</i>
hole | <i>ka</i>
Q | <i>doko</i>
where | <i>ka</i>
Q | <i>ni</i>
LOC |
| <i>kakusite</i>
hide.GER | | <i>oite,</i>
place.GER | | “ <i>Oya,</i>
hey | <i>koko</i>
here | <i>ni</i>
LOC | <i>zeni</i>
money | <i>ga</i>
NOM |
| <i>atta.</i>
exist.PST | <i>Koitu</i>
this | <i>de</i>
INS | <i>ippai</i>
one.CL | <i>nomoo.”</i>
drink.VOL | <i>to</i>
QUOT | <i>itte</i>
say.GER | | |
| <i>hito</i>
person | <i>o</i>
ACC | <i>gotisoo.suru</i>
treat.NONPST | <i>kuse</i>
habit | <i>ga</i>
NOM | <i>aru.</i>
exist.NONPST | | | |
| <i>Tokaku</i>
at.any.rate | | <i>hito</i>
person | <i>no</i>
GEN | | <i>ihyoo.ni.dete</i>
defy.expectations.GER | | | |
| <i>mitai</i>
see.DESID.NONPST | | <i>kuse</i>
habit | <i>no</i>
GEN | <i>otoko</i>
man | <i>da</i>
COP.NONPST | <i>ne.</i>
SFP | | |
- ‘This man had still other odd habits. He would take money that he had and when no one was looking hide it in a hole in a stone wall or somewhere and then say, “Hey, there’s some money here. Let’s have a drink with this.” At any rate, he’s a man who wants to try and surprise people.’
(IBUSE Masuji, *Ekimae Ryokan*)

The subject of the verb appositionally modifying this type of noun is always the possessor of the “habit” or the maker of the “promise”. It cannot be anyone else. Below is a list of some nouns of this type.

- (80) Semi-predicative nouns (Japanese)
kuse ‘(negative) habit’, *syuukan* ‘habit, custom’, *tati* ‘nature (of a person)’, *ito* ‘intention’, *tumori* ‘intent’, *ikoo* ‘volition’, *syukumei* ‘mission’, *unmei* ‘fate’, *mi.no.ue*

‘circumstance’, *keireki* ‘personal history’, *oboe* ‘memory’, *yakusoku* ‘promise’, *hoosin* ‘policy’, ...

Looking at this problem in English, the first problem that arises is that of the difference between the following kind of verbs.

- (81) a. I expected him to go.
b. I promised him to go.

In the (a) sentence, the subject of “to go” is “him” and in the (b) sentence it is “I”. This is due to the basic nature of a verb like “promise” where the subject of the action that includes “promising”, is the one making the promise. This can also be said of the associated noun. “Promise” can, in fact, be used as a noun, but one cannot say, for example, “I promise to you that he will ...”. In Japanese as well, while one cannot say *watasi wa ootoo ga syusseki.suru yakusoku o simasu* [I TOP younger.brother NOM attend.NONPST promise ACC make.NONPST] ‘I promise that my brother will attend’, one can say *watasi wa ootoo ni syusseki.saseru yakusoku o simasu*. [I TOP younger.brother.DAT attend.CAUS.NONPST promise ACC make.NONPST] ‘I promise I will make my brother attend.’ Here are some examples of nouns that take a subjectless modifying phrase of this type in English.

- (82) Semi-predicative nouns (English)
Ones that take “of ~ ing”: habit, custom, experience, advantage, privilege, risk, business, intention, ...

Ones that take “to ~(infinitive)”: intention, promise, attempt, tendency, desire, chance, right, effort, necessity, obligation, position, ability, ...

- (iv) “Relative” nouns and (reverse) content supplementing modification

Next we consider the structure and meaning of constructions with relative nouns and modifiers that (reverse) supplement the content of the head noun, a type for which it is generally difficult to find English equivalents.

- (83) Humiko ga suwatta usiro no mado
Fumiko NOM sit.PST behind GEN window

niwa, *momizi* *ga* *aokatta.*
LOC.TOP Japanese.maple NOM green.PST
‘In the window behind where Fumiko sat, the Japanese maple was green.’
(KAWABATA Yasunari, *Senbazuru*)

- (84) Oota.huzin ga motinusi deatta mae ni
Ota.Madam NOM owner COP.PST before OBL

kono *mizusasi* *ga* *dekite* *kara* *san.yon.hyaku.nen*

this	water.jug	NOM	be.made	since	3.or.4.hundred.years			
<i>no</i>	<i>aida</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>donna</i>		<i>unmei</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>hito</i>	<i>no</i>
GEN	span	OBL	what.kind.of		fate	GEN	person	GEN
<i>te</i>	<i>kara</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>watatte</i>		<i>kita</i>		<i>no</i>
hand	from	hand	to	be.passed		come.PST		NMLZ

daroo *ka*
COP.PRES Q

‘During the three or four hundred years since it was made and before Madam Ota was the owner, what were the fates of those through whose hands this water jug passed.’
(KAWABATA Yasunari, *Senbazuru*)

- (85) *Kaimono ni* *deta* *kaeri* *ni* *Genzidoo* *ni*
shopping DAT go.out.PST return LOC Genjidō LOC

yotta.
drop.in.PST
‘I dropped into Genjido on my way back from shopping.’

- (86) *[Makino-san* *to* *watasi* *ga]* *kimazuku* *natta*
Mr. Makino and I NOM awkward.ADVL become.PST

<u><i>hitotu</i></u>	<u><i>no</i></u>	<u><i>gen'in</i></u>		<i>wa,</i>	<i>watasi</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>o</i>
one	GEN	cause		TOP	I	NOM	picture	ACC

<i>umaku</i>	<i>kaku</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>hora.o.huita</i>	<i>koto</i>
skillful.ADVL	draw.NONPST	when	boast.PST	NMLZ

deatta.
COP.PST
‘One reason things became awkward [between Mr. Makino and me] was that when I drew a picture well I would brag about it.’
(IBUSE Masuji, *Banshun no Tabi*)

The semantic relation between this type of noun and the modifying part showing the content is unusual. For example, if in (83) it were *Humiko ga suwatta tatami no ue ni* [Fumiko NOM sit.PST *tatami* GEN above LOC] ‘on the *tatami* where Fumiko is sitting’, it would be an inner relation noun modification construction linked to *Humiko ga tatami no ue ni suwatta* ‘Fumiko sat on the *tatami*’, but Fumiko is not “sitting behind”, it is actually the reverse. The same can be said regarding *gen'in* ‘cause’ in (86). Since what the cause was is shown by what comes after, the part modifying *gen'in* is actually the result.

This sort of relative “reverse” content supplementing is possible only with nouns that

have the “relativity” characteristic. It is a type that is quite often found in Japanese. Those listed below are merely a few of the most typical ones. The relative type of noun never takes *toiu*.

(87) “Relative” nouns

Nouns with spatial or temporal relativity: *ue* ‘above’, *sita* ‘below’, *mae* ‘ahead, before’, *ato* ‘after’, *usiro* ‘behind’, *yokuzitu* ‘the following day’, *zenzitu* ‘the previous day’, *kaeri* ‘(one’s) return’, *tonari* ‘next door to’, *haigo* ‘background’, *naka* ‘inside’, *hanmen* ‘one side’, *ippoo* ‘on the one hand’, ...

Nouns expressing a cause and effect relation: *gen* ‘in ‘cause’, *kekka* ‘result’, *hoosyuu* ‘recompense’, *batu* ‘punishment’, *ato* ‘trace’, *kizuato* ‘scar’, *dasei* ‘inertia’, *nokori* ‘remainder’, *oturi* ‘change (from a purchase)’, *hyoosi* ‘chance’, *ikioi* ‘energy’, *mukui* ‘reward’, *tatari* ‘curse’, ...

Kekka ‘result’ was given as a member of the group in (54) [“fact” nouns], and in (88) below, it shows such characteristics (*toiu* could be inserted), but as it can also have the “relative” content supplementation, as in (89).

- (88) *Kono, ningen no hutan o karuku*
 this human GEN burden ACC light.ADV
siyoo.to.suru doryoku ga, kaette ningen ni
 attempt.to.make.NONPST effort NOM conversely human DAT
nokosareta syori no zyuuyoosei o
 leave.PASS.PST treatment GEN importance ACC
ukibori ni site iku kekka ni
 stark.relief DAT make.GER go.NONPST result DAT
natta.
 become.PST

‘This attempt to lighten the burden on people had the opposite effect of bringing into stark relief the importance of the treatment left to people.’

(KUBOYAMA Chiaki, *Saimon no Tōi Yume*)

- (89) *Ito no ansatu.sareta no wa, sude.ni*
 Itō GEN assassinate.PASS.PST NMLZ TOP already
tookan o yamete wa ita ga,
 resident-general ACC resign.GER TOP be.PST but

Kankokuzin no koo.iu urami ga
 Korean GEN this.kind.of resentment NOM

gyoosyuu.sita kekka deatta.
concentrate.PST result COP.PST

‘The assassination of Itō was a result of this accumulation of resentment by Koreans, although he had already resigned as resident-general.’

(NISHIOKA and KANO, *Nihon Kindaishi*)

There are many nouns like this and many ways of modifying them so, although the nouns themselves may not be recognized as having the “relative” quality, the type of modification can make it seem as though they do. For example, there are constructions like *Yonago ni tomatta asa* ‘(lit) the morning I stayed overnight in Yonago = the morning after the night I stayed in Yonago’.

Of course, nouns and conjunctions with the quality of relativity can be found in English as well. However, they do not take modification in the same way as such nouns do in Japanese. As partial correspondence, there are expressions like “the year after ...” for ...*yokutosi* or “the day before ...” for ...*zenzitu*. For “result”, like Japanese *kekka* there are two uses: when showing the content of the result, an expression like “with the result that ...” is used and when showing the “relative” content supplementation an expression like “the result of (his resignation)” is used.

- c. **Other matters** – the boundary region between inner and outer relations, complex kinds of modification, and contracted forms of modification

In the preceding, we have examined inner relation and outer relation as the main types of modification, but when dealing with real-life examples in Japanese, it is sometimes difficult to decide which type a given example belongs to.

Most such examples are cases in which the head noun could be inserted into the modifying clause accompanied by the particle *de*, such as:

syukke.sita dooki
enter.the.priesthood.PST motivation
‘motivation for entering the priesthood’

kayu gurai susureru kasegi
rice.gruel at.least slurp.POTEN.NONPST earnings
‘earnings sufficient to at least eat rice gruel’

niwa e detari suru genki
garden to go.out.REPRESENTATIVE do.NONPST vigor
‘vigor sufficient to do such things as go out into the yard’

hito ga kati o hakaru memori
people NOM value ACC measure.NONPST scale
‘the scale by which people measure value’

On the other hand, they could also be treated as instances of the outer relation *~suru tame no* N ‘an N for the sake of doing ~’ with the modifying clause providing the content of purpose of the action. If directly translated into English such examples would probably be realized as relative clauses with “by which”, “for which”, “with which”, “in which”, or the like.

The semantic relations between the modifying clause and the head noun include those that have the meaning ... *hodo no* ‘to the extent that ...’ (90), or that are understood as being augmented with ...(*sita*) *toki no* ‘when (someone did) ...’ (91). In English, explicit inclusion of such conjunctions is probably necessary.

- (90) *Hadairo* *wa* *saenai* *ga* *karada* *no*
 skin.color TOP clear.NEG.NONPST but body GEN
sen *wa* *e* *ni* *naru* *utukusisa*
 lines TOP picture DAT become.NONPST beauty
o *motte* *ita.*
 ACC have.GER be.PST
 ‘Her skin color was not so vivid, but her body lines have such beauty they could be made into a picture.’
 (ISHIKAWA Tatsuzō, *Shareta Kankei*)

- (91) *Yahei* *wa,* *Hikositi* *ga* *zyuuroku.nen* *tatte*
 Yahei TOP Hikoshichi NOM 16.years pass.GER
mo *mada* *Ryoogen o* *nikunde ite,* *syussyo.site*
 even still Ryōgen ACC hate.GER be.GER get.out.of.prison.GER
kita *ue* *wa* *zehi* *atte*
 come.PST top TOP by.all.means meet.GER
mitai *to* *itta* *osorosii* *metuki*
 see.DESID.NONPST QUOT say.PST frightening look
o *omoidasita.*
 ACC recall.PST
 ‘Yahei recalled the frightening expression in Hikoshichi’s eyes when he said he wanted to meet with Ryogen, whom he still hated even though 16 years had passed, when he got out of prison.’
 (MIZUKAMI Tsutomu, *Mida no Mai*)

There are many other examples like those below about which I am not sure how to classify the semantic relations between the head nouns and the modifying parts.

zibun *ga* *hara* *o* *itameta* *musume*
 self NOM stomach ACC hurt.PST daughter

‘(lit) the daughter who one hurt one’s stomach = the daughter she had given birth to’

<i>atama</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>yoku</i>	<i>naru</i>	<i>hon</i>
head	NOM	good.ADV	become.NONPST	book

‘(lit) at book that you will become smart = a book the reading of which will make you smarter’

<i>otoko</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>onna</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>kuroo.sitagaru</i>	<i>kao</i>
man	NOM	woman	INS	go.through.hardships.DESID.NONPST	face

‘(lit) a face that men want to go through hardships because of a woman = A face so attractive that men would willingly undergo hardship for the woman’s sake’

At this point I can see no other way to handle such sentences that to treat them as some kind of contracted form.

It appears an easy thing to categorize in detail modification by clauses, but compared to conjoining words, phrases or sentences with conjunctions, fundamentally the semantic relation between the head noun and the clause is such that it is left to the hearer to imagine based on his or her knowledge of the semantic characteristics of each and on this point we have returned to the same sort of connection as in the ‘Noun *no* noun’ construction with which we began this chapter.

References

- *** General work on English or Japanese grammar, but contains essential descriptions of noun modification constructions
- ** Comprehensive description of noun modification constructions
- * Deals with particular problems, but especially important

- *** Alphonso, A. 1966. *Japanese Language Patterns: A Structural Approach*. Sophia University Press.

- * Biard, A. 1908. L'article "the" et les caractéristiques différentielles de son employ. (Japanese translation by Kuriyagawa, Fumio. 1957. *Teikanshiron* [Theory of definite articles]. *Eigogaku Raiburari* (8). Kenkyūsha.

- * Bolinger, D. 1967. Adjectives in English. *Lingua* 18.

- * Hawkins, J. A. 1978. *Definiteness and Indefiniteness – A Study in Reference and Grammaticality Prediction*. Humanities Press.

- *** Inoue, Kazuko. 1976. *Henkei Bunpō to Nihongo (Jō)* [Transformational grammar and Japanese (Part I)]. Taishūkan Shoten.

- ** Isshiki, Masako. 1968. *Shūshoku (Jō)* [Modification (Part I)] *Eigo no Gohō Hyōgenhen dai 9 kan* [English grammatical expressions – volume 9]. Kenkyūsha. {a most comprehensive description of noun modification constructions in English with attention to the realities of Japanese learning English. Broadly divided into modifiers that precede the noun and those that follow with more detailed categorization by part of speech.}

- * Jackendoff, R. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T Press.

- *** Jespersen, O. 1925. *Philosophy of Grammar*. London: George Allen and Urwin.

- * Josephs, L. S. 1972. Phenomena of tense and aspect in Japanese relative clauses. *Language* 48.

- ** Josephs, L. S. 1976. Complementation. *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*. Ed. by M. Shibatani, New York: Academic Press.

- * Kajita, M. 1968. Problems of relative clauses in a transformational grammar. *Eigo Kyōiku* June, July, 1968. Taishūkan Shoten.

- ** Kawabata, Yoshiaki. 1959. *Rentai (ichi)* [Adnominals (1)]. *Kokogo Kokubun* 28.10.

- ** Kawabata, Yoshiaki. 1960. *Rentai (ni) – Go no kenzaiteki keishiki to gojun to* [Adnominals

(2) – Explicit word forms and word order]. *Kokugo Kokubun* 29.8.

- * Kindaichi, Haruhiko. 1953. *Fuhenka jodōshi no honshitsu (jō, ge)* [The nature of invariant auxiliary verbs (parts 1 and 2)] *Kokugo Kokubun* 22.3, 4 (Reprinted in *Ronshū Nihongo Kenkyū 7: Jodōshi* [Collected papers in Japanese studies 7: Auxiliary verbs]. Yūseidō. 1979).
- * Kleinjans, E. 1958. *A Descriptive-Comparative Study Predicting Interference for Japanese in Learning English Noun-Head Modification Patterns*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan.
- *** Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *Nihon Bunpō Kenkyū* [Studies in Japanese Grammar]. Taishūkan Shoten.
- * Kuroda, S-Y. 1969. English relativization and certain related problems. *Modern Studies in English*. Eds. D. Reibel and S. Schane, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- * Kuroda, S-Y. 1974, 1975/76. Pivot-independent relativization in Japanese I, II. *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 3, 4.
- * Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 1976. *Nihongo no ronri – shikō* [Logic and thought in Japanese]. *Iwanami Kōza Nihongo dai 1 kan: Nihongo to Kokugo* [Iwanami series Japanese volume 1: Japanese and national language]. Iwanami Shoten.
- * Lees, R. B. 1960. *The Grammar of English Nominalizations*. The Hague: Mouton.
- * Makino, S. 1968. *Some Aspects of Japanese Nominalizations*. Ph.D. Dissertation University of Illinois. (Tokai University Press, 1969)
- * Makishita, Yoshio. 1972. *Kankeishi hyōgen to Nihongo sōtō hyōgen no hikaku* [Comparison of relative clause expressions and corresponding expressions in Japanese]. *Kwansei Gakuin Daigaku Ronkō* 20.
- *** Martin, S. 1975. *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- * McCawley, J. D. 1973. Relativization. *The Chicago Which Hunt: Papers from the Relative Clause Festival*. Chicago Linguistics Society. (Reprinted in *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*. Ed. M. Shibatani, New York: Academic Press)
- *** Mikami, Akira. 1972. *Gendai Gohō Josetu* [Introduction to modern grammar]. Kuroshio Shuppan.
- * Mikami, Akira. 1975. *Rentai to ren'yō* [Adnominal and adverbial]. *Mikami Akira Ronbunshū* [Collected works of Mikami Akira]. Kuroshio Shuppan.
- * Nakagawa, Masayuki. 1975. “Duo”, “yuān”, to “de” – *Nihongo to no hikaku kara* [“Duo

‘many’”, “*yuǎn* ‘far’”, and “*de* ‘ADN’” from a comparison with Japanese]. *Ajia-Afurikago no Keisū Kenkyū* 1. Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku Ajia-Afurika Gengo Bunka Kenkyūsho.

- ** Nakau, M. 1973. *Sentential Complementation in Japanese*. Kaitakusha.
- * Ogawa, Saburō. 1954. *Futeishi* [Infinitives] *Eibunpō Sirīzu dai 16 kan* [English grammar series – volume 16]. Kenkyūsha.
- ** Okutsu, Keiichirō. 1974. *Seisei Bunpōron – Meishiku no Kōzō* [Generative grammar theory – noun phrase structure]. Taishūkan Shoten.
- * Okutsu, Keiichirō. 1975. *Fukugōmeishi no seiseibunpō* [Generative grammar of compound nouns]. *Kokugogaku* 101.
- ** Sakuda, Kanae. 1957. *Shūshoku no kinō* [Functions of modification]. *Nihon Bunpō Kōza dai 5 kan* [Japanese grammar series – volume 5]. Meiji Shoin. (Reprinted in *Nihonteki Hyōgen no Gengo Kagaku* [The linguistics of Japanese expressions]. Kōseisha Kōoseikaku. 1967.)
- * Selkirk, E. 1977. Some remarks on noun phrase structure. *Formal Syntax*. Eds. P. W. Culicover, T. Wasow, and A. Akmajian. New York: Academic Press.
- * Smith, C. 1964. Determiners and relative clauses in the generative grammar of English. *Language* 40.
- ** Smith, D. L. 1970. *A Study of Japanese Sentence Complement Constructions*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan.
- * Sukida, Minoru. 1976. ‘Many’ no *jojutsu yōhō* [Predicative use of ‘many’]. *Eibei Kenkyū* 9. Ōsaka Gaikokugo Daigaku.
- ** Takahashi, Tarō. 1959. *Dōshi no Rentaishūshokuhō* [Verbal adnominal modification]. *Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūsho Ronshū 1: Kotoba no Kenkyū* [NINJAL Collection 1: Studies on words].
- * Takahashi, Tarō. 1974. *Rentaiei no motsu tōgoronteki.na kinō to keitaironteki.na seikaku no kankei* [The connection between the syntactic functions of the adnominal form and its morphological characteristics]. *Kyōiku Kokugo* 39. Mugi Shobō.
- ** Takahashi, Tarō. 1979. *Rentaidōshiku to meishi no kakawariai nitsuite no josetsu* [Introduction to the relation between verbal adnominal phrases and nouns]. *Gengo no Kenkyū*. Mugi Shobō.
- ** Teramura, H. 1971. The syntax of noun modification in Japanese. *Journal-Newsletter of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 6.

- ** Teramura, Hideo. 1975-78. *Rentaishūshoku no shintakkusu to imi 1-4* [The syntax and semantics of adnominal modification 1-4]. *Nihongo – Nihonbunka* 4~7. Ōsaka Gaikokugo Daigaku.
- * Thompson, S. A. 1971. The deep structure of relative clauses. *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*. Eds. C. J. Fillmore and D. T. Langendoen. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- *** Tokieda, Motoki. 1956. *Koten Kaishaku no tame no Nihon Bunpō* [Japanese grammar for interpretation of classic Japanese]. Shibundō.
- * Tokieda, Motoki. 1958. *Jōkenhō toshite kaishaku.sareru rentaikei no yōhō – hitodute ni kikoehaberu wa, koto no ha mo tudukihaberazu* [Uses of the adnominal interpreted as conditionals –If you interpose an intermediary, I cannot speak to you]. *Kokugo to Kokubungakui*. Shibundō. (Reprinted in *Tokieda Motoki Hakase Ronbunshū Dai ni Satsu*. Iwanami Shoten. 1975.)
- *** Watanabe, Minoru. 1971. *Kokugo Kōbunron* [Structure of Japanese]. Haniwa Shobō.