

[Notes]

# The indexical function of the *NO* complementizer in Japanese\*

Hirofumi Hosokawa

## 1. Introduction

The complementizers *no* and *koto* in Japanese have the grammatical role of nominalizing a proposition and the nominalized sentence appears in the subject or object position. However, these complementizers exhibit some differences in meaning, which have been discussed by Kuno (1973), Josephs (1976), Teramura (1984), and Horie (1997), among others. Kuno (1973: 221) characterizes these differences as follows:

*Koto* is used to nominalize a proposition that the context allows (or forces) us to construe as an ABSTRACT CONCEPT, while *no* nominalizes a proposition that can (or must) be understood as a CONCRETE EVENT.

Josephs (1976: 325) accounts for the differences with the cover terms ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’: “*no* has a semantic feature like ‘direct’ and *koto* has a semantic feature like ‘indirect’.” However, a fundamental problem still remains: where, precisely, does the ‘direct’ nature of *no* come from? The aim of this paper is to investigate the function of the *no* complementizer and to show that the ‘directness’ is derived from the ‘indexical’ function of the pro-noun *no*.

This paper consists of seven sections. In Section 2, we will review

Josephs (1976) and contrast the semantic differences between *no* and *koto* complementizers. In Section 3, we will examine the formal nouns *koto* and *mono* as well as the pro-noun *no*. We will show that *mono* and *no* share some basic properties. In Section 4, we will examine *no* and *koto* complementizers and show that they share semantic characteristics with the pro-noun *no* and the formal noun *koto*, respectively. In Sections 5 and 6, we will extend our examination to the head-internal relative clause, which also takes *no*, and the auxiliary *no da*, respectively. We will show that the ‘direct’ nature of *no* is found in these expressions. In the final section, we will summarize our observations.

One point should be noted here on the use of these complementizers. It is often said that the choice of *no* and *koto* is a stylistic matter and that young people more easily accept the use of *no* in place of *koto*. Sociolinguistically, this is an interesting view, but we do not take this position since *no* and *koto* are NOT interchangeable in most cases. We will argue that they represent different construal for a given situation.

## 2. Josephs (1976)

In this section, we will review previous studies on the complementizers *no* and *koto*, particularly, Josephs (1976), which provides a comprehensive account of this topic.

First, consider a group of verbs which take *no* complements as their object.<sup>1</sup> These are verbs of sense perception, discovery, helping and stopping. Commonly found among these verbs is the feature ‘directness.’ The subject of the main sentence is involved in directly perceiving, or responding to, a simultaneously occurring or imminent event, which is represented by the *no* complement proposition. The *koto* complementizer cannot be used in these examples.

- (1) a. Watakusi wa Hanako ga oyoide iru no o mita<sup>2</sup> (my underline)  
I-TOP Hanako-NOM swimming is -ACC saw  
'I saw Hanako swimming.'
- b. Heya ni hairu to watakusi wa kodomo ga tabako o nonde iru  
room to enter and I-TOP child-NOM cigarette-ACC smoking  
no o mituketa  
is -ACC discovered  
'When I entered the room, I caught the child smoking.'
- c. Boku wa kanozyo ga komatte iru no o tasukete ageta  
I-TOP she-NOM in trouble is -ACC helped  
'I helped her when she was in trouble.'
- d. Sensei wa kodomo ga tabako o sutte iru no o  
teacher-TOP child-NOM cigarette-ACC smoking is -ACC  
tometa  
stopped  
'The teacher stopped the child from smoking the cigarette.'

In contrast with the verbs in (1), the verbs in (2) take only *koto* complements. *Yookyuu suru* 'request' in (2a) and *teian suru* 'propose' in (2b) are 'futuristic verbs,' and they take propositions which represent future events<sup>3</sup>. *Suitei suru* 'infer' in (2c) and *narau* 'learn' in (2d) are 'factive verbs,' and take factive propositions as their objects. These verbs impose upon the embedded proposition the connotation of 'abstract concept,' which is not directly perceived by the senses. The complements of futuristic verbs and factive verbs represent events which occur at some other time than the event represented in the main verb itself. In contrast to the relationship in (1) which he characterized as 'direct,' Josephs calls

this relationship ‘indirect.’ Since such complement propositions do not represent directly perceived events, the *no* complementizer cannot be used. In such cases Josephs insists that *koto* must be used instead.

- (2) a. Kare wa kanozyo ni zisyoku suru koto o yookyuu sita  
he-TOP she-DAT resign do -ACC demanded/requested  
‘He demanded that she resign.’
- b. Sihainin wa raisyuu no nitiyoobi ni kooba o heisa suru  
manager-TOP next week-GEN Sunday on factory-ACC close  
koto o teian sita  
-ACC proposed  
‘The manager proposed to close the factory next Sunday.’
- c. Taroo wa Ziroo ga sensei o korosita koto o tadasiku  
Taroo-TOP Ziroo-NOM teacher-ACC killed -ACC correctly  
suitei sita  
inferred  
‘Taro inferred, correctly, that Jiro killed the teacher.’
- d. Kodomotati wa Koronbusu ga Amerikatairiku o  
children-TOP Columbus-NOM American continent-ACC  
hakken sita koto o naratta  
discovered -ACC learned  
‘The children learned that Columbus discovered America.’

The examples we have seen so far seem to be clear-cut in terms of the complementizer selection. The matrix verbs in (3), however, allow both *no* and *koto* complements. The verbs in this kind are verbs of prevention, expectation, and understanding.

- (3) a. Hanzai ga syoorai okoru no/koto o  
 crime-NOM future arise -ACC  
 boosi sinakereba narimasen  
 prevent must  
 ‘We’ve got to prevent crime from occurring in the future.’
- b. Watakusi wa Ziroo ga kuru no/koto o kitai site ita  
 I-TOP Ziroo-NOM come -ACC expecting was  
 ‘I was expecting Jiro to come.’
- c. Kanozyo wa sono kutiburi kara keikaku ga umaku itte  
 she-TOP that way of speaking from plan-NOM going well  
 inai no/koto ga wakatta  
 is not -NOM understood  
 ‘From the way he spoke, she understood that the plan wasn’t going well.’

Prima facie, these last examples seem to offer problems to the former analysis since the verbs take both *no* and *koto* complementizers. However, a closer examination reveals that this is not the case. If we consider the situations in which these statements are given, then, we will see that the ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ features also play a significant role. The choice of the complementizers forces us to construe the same proposition differently. Josephs (1976: 335) explains this construal difference as follows:

When a verb of prevention cooccurs with <direct> *no*, the need to prevent the action or event of the embedded proposition is considered to be urgent or immediate—in other words, the speaker has a strong conviction or belief that the event is likely to occur in the very near future. With <indirect> *koto*, however, the sense of urgency or im-

mediacy is absent, and instead, the speaker has a weaker conviction about the likelihood of the future event.

The examples in (4) are also interesting. The matrix predicates of these sentences represent the speaker's emotional response to the complement proposition.

- (4) a. Kare ga biiru o zyuppon mo nonda no/\*koto ni wa  
he-NOM beer-ACC ten bottles as much drank - DAT TOP  
odoroita  
was shocked  
'I was shocked by his having drunk all of ten bottles of beer.'
- b. Hanako-san ga okurete kuru ?no/koto wa gaman dekimasen  
Hanako-NOM late come - TOP can't stand  
'I can't stand Hanako's (always) coming late.'

In (4), the tense of the matrix verbs plays an important role. According to Josephs (1976: 342-343), tense and the choice of the complementizers are related as follows:

If the verb is in the past tense, it represents an instantaneous reaction to a directly experienced event, and if, however, the verb is in the present tense, it represents a durative state that is separated from the stimulus event, and, therefore, the cooccurring embedded sentence can also be nominalized with *koto*.

These observations lend support to the view that *no* is 'direct' whereas *koto* is 'indirect.'

We have observed that *no* and *koto* have different functions and that

the selection of the complementizers correspond to the type of matrix verbs. A certain group of verbs are dichotomous for the selection of the complementizers. They allow only one type of complementizer, not the other. In contrast, some verbs or predicates allow both *no* and *koto* complementizers, forcing us to construe the complement proposition differently. All these data corroborate the observation that the notion ‘directness’ and ‘indirectness’ plays a significant role for the meanings of these complementizers.

The problem, however, is where the ‘directness’ of *no* comes from. Some scholars, such as Martin (1975) and Horie (1997), speculate that *no* was truncated from the formal noun *mono*. Although the validity of this speculation needs to be confirmed in terms of historical linguistics, this hypothesis is well worth considering since these two words share some basic properties. In the following section, we will investigate the formal nouns *koto* and *mono* and the pro-noun *no*.

### 3. The formal (pro)-nouns *koto*, *mono*, and *no*

There are a small set of nouns in Japanese which are called formal nouns. *Mono* and *koto* belong to this category. Semantically, they have abstract meaning because of the formal nature. However, they are contrastive to each other regarding what they refer to.

In (5) and (6), *koto* is used. It cannot be replaced by *mono*. In (5a), *koto* refers to an abstract situation, and with *nariyuki* ‘development,’ it represents the ‘course of events.’ In (5b), it refers to the circumstances the speaker is facing. In (6a) and (6b), *koto* refers to what is said and what is done, respectively. The only noticeable difference between (5) and (6) is that *koto* phrases in (5) are idiomatic expressions and the referent is entrenched linguistically, while those in (6) are freely determined by the verbs of the embedded clauses.

- (5) a. Koto no nariyuki o mite kime tai  
 -GEN development-ACC see decide want  
 ‘Judging from how things will go, I would like to decide (what to do).’
- b. Koto to sidai de wa purojecto o tyuusi sinakereba naranai  
 and development PART TOP project-ACC cancel have to  
 ‘If the worst comes to the worst, we may have to cancel this project.’
- (6) a. Ken ga itta koto wa matigatte iru  
 Ken-NOM said -TOP wrong  
 ‘What Ken said is wrong.’
- b. Kimi ga sita koto wa tadasii  
 you-NOM did -TOP right  
 ‘What you did is right.’

In (7), however, *mono* is used. It cannot be replaced by *koto*. It refers to a countable entity or activity. *Mono* in (7a) designates ‘important figure,’ and *mono o iu* in (7b) refers to an activity of talking.

- (7) a. Ken wa shoorai mono ni naru daroo  
 Ken-TOP future -GEN become will  
 ‘Ken will make something of himself in the future.’
- b. Me wa kuti hodo ni mono o iu  
 eyes-TOP mouth like-GEN -ACC speak  
 ‘The eyes are more eloquent than the lips.’



The semantic differences between *koto* and *mono* are difficult to characterize due to the abstract nature of the meanings. However, the following examples show the differences clearly. In (8a), *koto* refers to the content to be written, while *mono* in (8b) refers to a writing instrument like a pen.

- (8) a. Kaku koto ga nai  
write -NOM nil  
'There is nothing to write about.'
- b. Kaku mono ga nai  
write -NOM nil  
'There is nothing to write with.'

Although *koto* and *mono* could refer to various entities, the referent is easily determined by the linguistic context in which they are used.<sup>4</sup>

Now we will examine the pro-noun *no* and attempt to show that *no* shares some important characteristics with *mono*. Consider the following examples. Syntactically, the verbs, *tataku* 'hit,' *kau* 'buy' and *au* 'meet,' take *no*. It is modified by the *rentai* or attributive form of verbal conjugation, which demonstrates that *no* is in the noun class. Semantically, *no* in (9a) through (9d) indicates discrete entities: people, objects, places, and calendrical time, respectively. So *no* in its function as a pro-noun refers to any one of a range of discrete bounded entities, each one of which is a particular object or *mono* in Japanese. The particular entities referred to by *no* in (9a) – (9d) are all examples of *mono*.

- (9) a. Naomi o tataita no wa Ken da  
Naomi-ACC hit -TOP Ken COP  
'It is Ken who hit Naomi.'

- b. Ken ga katta no wa hon da  
 Ken-NOM bought -TOP book COP  
 ‘It is the book which Ken bought.’
- c. Ken ga Naomi ni atta no wa koko da  
 Ken-NOM Naomi-GEN met -TOP here COP  
 ‘It was here that Ken met Naomi.’
- d. Ken ga Naomi ni atta no wa sigatu datta  
 Ken-NOM Naomi-GEN met -TOP April was  
 ‘It was in April when Ken met Naomi.’

Teramura (1984: 306) suggests that this type of *no* should be called a ‘pro-noun,’ if ever such a category exists in Japanese. It should be noted here, however, that *no* and *mono* are not complete isomorphisms. Unlike *mono*, *no* is structurally dependent on other sentential elements. It always needs modifiers to be realized grammatically. *No* cannot replace *mono* in (7a) and (7b). As such, it is different from the English pro-nouns, which are structurally independent. We should rather call this category a ‘quasi pro-noun,’ provisionally. In this paper, however, we will simply call it a ‘pro-noun’ since this word is more conventionally used in the literature.

Modifiers of the *no* pro-noun do not have to be sentential as illustrated in (9). In (10a), the nominal-adjective (or *na*-adjective) and in (10b) the regular adjective (*i*-adjective) modify *no* pro-noun. As is the case with *mono*, the referents are determined by the context. In (10a), *no* refers to a particular fresh entity that the speaker and hearer know through their shared knowledge. Likewise, in (10b), it refers to a particular round entity which exists within the region the speaker and hearer share.

- (10) a. Sinsen na no o okutte kudasai  
fresh      -ACC send please  
'Please send me a fresh one.'
- b. Kore ja nakute marui no o totte kuremasu ka?  
this    not    round -ACC take-Q  
'Not this one, but the round one. Would you pass it to me?'

What is illustrated in (9) and (10) is the 'indexical' force of the *no* pro-noun referring to discrete bounded entities. We maintain that it is this feature which is found in the *no* complementizer.

#### 4. The complementizers *no* and *koto*

Martin (1975) and Horie (1997) speculate that the *no* complementizer is a truncated version of *mono*. If this is the case, it is very likely that both *no* and *koto* complementizers originate in the formal nouns *mono* and *koto*, respectively. Since the *no* complementizer does not keep its original form, however, we postulate that it was grammaticalized by way of the pro-noun *no* after truncation from *mono*. This hypothesis, if correct, suggests that the functional feature of the *no* pro-noun should be found in the complementizer *no*. The following discussion strongly reveals that this hypothesis is plausible.

It is observed that the stative predicates, *aru* 'exist,' and *dekiru* 'able,' take the *koto*-complementizer in Japanese. The *no* complementizer does not appear with these predicates.<sup>5</sup> Consider the examples in (11). The complement proposition in (11a), *igirisu ni itta* 'Ken went to Britain,' represents a concrete event, but *koto* encodes a meaning like experience to the proposition. Likewise, the complement proposition in (11b) represents a concrete event, to which *koto* encodes a meaning like necessity.

This view is reinforced by the fact that *koto* in (11a) and (11b) can be replaced by the content words *keiken* ‘experience,’ and *hituyoo* ‘necessity,’ respectively. The *koto* complementizer retains the basic semantic features of the formal noun *koto*.

- (11) a. Ken wa igirisu ni itta \*no/koto ga aru  
 Ken-TOP Britain to went -NOM is  
 ‘Ken has been to Britain.’
- b. Isoide ie ni kaeru \*no/koto wa nai  
 in a hurry home go -TOP nil  
 ‘You don’t have to go home in a hurry.’

Unlike in (11), the *no* complementizer is used in (12). The *koto* complementizer cannot appear in these examples. In (12a), the complement proposition represents a concrete event, which is a cause of the state expressed by the matrix predicate. In (12b), the demonstrative expression *sokomade* ‘that much’ illustrates that the complement proposition represents a concrete event. Unlike *koto*, *no* does not encode any abstract meaning to the complement proposition.

- (12) a. Maiban osoku made sigoto o suru no/\*koto wa tukareru  
 every night late till work-ACC do -TOP tiring  
 ‘Working late every night is tiring.’
- b. Soko made iu no/\*koto wa koku da  
 that much tell -TOP thoughtless COP  
 ‘You shouldn’t have said that.’

It is clear from (11) and (12) that *koto* encodes an abstract sense to the

proposition, while *no* indicates a directly perceived event.

Now we will look at some of the examples in Section 2 again, and show that these characteristics can be observed in these examples, too. The examples of (1a) and (2a) are repeated here as (13a) and (13b).

- (13) a. Watakusi wa Hanako ga oyoide iru no o mita  
I-TOP Hanako-NOM swimming is -ACC saw  
'I saw Hanako swimming.'
- b. Kare wa kanozyo ni zisyoku suru koto o yookyuu sita  
he-TOP she-DAT resign do -ACC demanded/requested  
'He demanded that she resign.'

The complement proposition in (13a) represents a visually perceived event. *No* nominalizes such a proposition. In contrast, the complement proposition in (13b) represents a future event. *Koto* encodes to the proposition an abstract meaning like request. Since the *no* complementizer refers to the event of a direct perception, it is compatible with verbs which represent a concrete event: verbs of sense perception, discovery, helping and stopping. *Koto*, instead, encodes an abstract concept to the complement proposition. It is most suitable with verbs of cognition: verbs of ordering, proposal, and advice.

The examples in (14) represent the speaker's evaluation of the events described in the complement propositions. The contrast is striking in these examples. Sentence (14a) describes the two co-occurring events; 'Mark is speaking Japanese' and 'the speaker is evaluating his Japanese.' The interjection *oya* 'oh!' and the confirmative particle *ne* indicate that this complement proposition is episodic. Thus, *no* is the most suitable candidate as a complementizer. Contrastively, sentence (14b) represents a suggestion in general. The speaker is saying that it is always the case

at international conferences that you need to speak your opinion clearly. It does not presuppose a particular event. Thus, *koto* is selected.

(14) a. Oya, Mark wa nihongo o hanasu no/?koto ga zyoozu da  
oh, Mark-TOP Japanese-ACC speak -NOM good COP  
ne  
PART

‘Oh, Mark speaks very good Japanese, doesn’t he?’

b. Kokusai kaigi de wa iken o hakkiri noberu  
international conference at-TOP opinion-ACC clearly speak  
\*no/koto ga hituyoo da  
-NOM necessary COP

‘In international conferences, you need to speak your opinion clearly.’

All the examples we have seen in this section reveal that the *no* complementizer indicates a concrete event.

## 5. The head-internal relative clause

In this and the following sections, we will examine some other constructions involving *no*. It is observed that the *no* complementizer appears in the head-internal relative clause.<sup>6</sup> Compare the following examples from Nomura (2001: 230).

(15) a. [sara no ue ni atta] ringo o totte tabeta  
plate-GEN top at was apple-ACC took ate  
‘I ate an apple which was on the plate.’

- b. [ringo ga sara no ue ni atta] no o totte tabeta  
apple-NOM plate-GEN top at was -ACC took ate  
'I ate an apple which was on the plate.'

Sentence (15a) contains a head-external relative clause. The head *ringo* 'apple' is outside the relative clause. This is the most common relative clause in Japanese. In addition to this type, there exists the head-internal relative clause as given in (15b). It is different from the former in some respects. First, the head remains inside the relative clause. Secondly, it is an independent clause, so it needs a nominalizer to become a part of the matrix sentence. Thirdly, the complement proposition represents a visually perceived event by the subject.

The visual perception of the complement proposition is attested to in the following examples.

- (16) a. Watasi wa [miti ni otiteita] okane o keisatu ni todoketa  
I-TOP [street on dropped] money-ACC police to took  
'I took the money which I had found on the street to the police.'
- b. Keisatu wa [miti ni otiteita] okane o uketotta  
police-TOP [street on dropped] money-ACC received  
'The police received the money which I had found on the street.'
- (17) a. Watasi wa [okane ga miti ni otiteita] no o keisatu ni  
I-TOP [money-NOM street on dropped] -ACC police to  
todoketa  
took  
'I took the money which I had found on the street to the

police.’

- b. \*Keisatu wa [okane ga miti ni otiteita] no o  
police-TOP [money-NOM street on dropped] -ACC  
uketotta  
received  
‘The police received the money which I had found on the  
street.’

The examples show that not all head-external relative clauses can be replaced by a head-internal counterpart. In (16), which contain a head-external relative clause, both (16a) and (16b) are grammatical. However, in (17), which contain a head-internal relative clause, only (17a) is grammatical. The pairs are different from each other in that the recipient NP in (16a) and (17a) appears in the subject position in (16b) and (17b), where the subject does not perceive that the money was found on the street. The fact that (16b) is grammatical shows that the head-external relative clause does not require the subject of the matrix sentence to perceive the event it represents. In contrast, the ungrammaticality of (17b) reveals that the head-internal relative clause, to which the complementizer *no* is attached, requires the subject of the matrix sentence to perceive the event which it represents. It clearly shows that *no* has an indexical function referring to the directly perceived event.

On the ‘direct’ feature of *no*, Horie (1997: 887) expresses his view as follows:

It is not entirely clear at this stage whether it really encodes directness/concreteness by itself. It is possible that the absence of any inherent semantic contribution of complementizer *no* happens to be



compatible with particular semantic classes of predicates (e.g. perception verbs) that clearly disfavor *koto*, thereby creating the epiphenomenal directness/concreteness connotation in contrast to the more abstract and indirect *koto*.

However, we do not take this ‘epiphenomenal’ view. As we saw in (3), some verbs can take BOTH *no* and *koto* complementizers, forcing us to construe the same proposition differently. If the ‘directness’ is not encoded by the complementizer and it only results from co-occurring predicates, such a semantic difference cannot be explained. We will rather follow the generalization provided by Josephs (1976: 344).

The distribution of the nominalizers *no* and *koto* is determined by a principle of semantic compatibility which states that cooccurring nominalizers, predicates, and embedded sentences must have matching features—i.e., they must all be either <direct> or <indirect>.

This generalization, although it is insightful, does not refer to the fundamental problem about where the ‘direct’ feature comes from. We maintain that it originates in the ‘indexical’ function of the pro-noun *no*. In the following section, we will examine the modal auxiliary *no da* and show that the ‘direct’ feature can also be observed there.

## 6. The modal auxiliary *no da*

There has been considerable discussion of the composite auxiliary *no da*. Kuno (1973) and Teramura (1984) among others provide a semantic account of this expression. Morphologically, *no da* is a combination of *no* and *da*. The latter is a conclusive marker and is used to end sentences with. It also has the function of emphasizing a speaker’s belief for, or

conviction to, a proposition. In this section, we will attempt to show that the ‘indexical’ function can also be found in *no da*.

Contrast the subtle differences in meaning between (18a) and (18b). In (18a), the speaker describes what she noticed at the time of utterance; namely, ‘Oh, my cell phone is ringing.’ This statement is not addressed to a hearer, however. It is said to the speaker herself with no one around her. In contrast, the sentence in (18b) is a statement aimed to be addressed to the hearer. It presupposes not only that the hearer was with the speaker when the speech event took place, but also that the speaker was aware that the hearer noticed the ringing of the phone. Therefore, the sentence would sound awkward, if it were uttered in a context where no one else present heard it. *No da* is categorized as modal auxiliary in Japanese grammar. *No* in (18b) refers to the hearer’s attitude. The speaker is responding to it.

(18) a. Ah, watasi no keitai ga natte iru  
ah I-GEN cell phone-NOM ringing  
‘Oh, my cell phone is ringing!’

b. Watasi no keitai ga natte iru no desu<sup>7</sup>  
I-GEN cell phone-NOM ringing -COP  
‘That’s the sound of my cell phone.’

Let us consider the following examples provided by Kuno (1973: 226). (19a) can be addressed to the person looking out of the window. No presupposition is necessary. However, (19b) is more appropriately used in the following context: the speaker inferred that it might be raining when she saw the hearer holding an umbrella, and to make it sure, she asked the hearer if it was raining.

- (19) a. Ame ga hutte-imasu ka?  
rain-NOM falling-Q  
'Is it raining?'
- b. Ame ga hutte-iru no desu ka?  
rain-NOM falling -COP-Q  
'(You have an umbrella, you look drenched, etc.) Is it the case that it is raining?'

There is another meaning of *no da* and we will compare it with its variant *koto da*. The examples in (20) are caution statements, and usually, in this use, the final *da* is omitted. The 'indirect' nature of *koto* and the 'indexical' nature of *no* can be observed in (20a) and (20b), respectively. Sentence (20a) is usually found on the wall of a library. It is for the general attention of users of the library. It is not directed to particular people. It only states that this is the rule to be observed. Thus, this is compatible with the 'indirect' nature of *koto*. In contrast, it is unlikely that sentence (20b) is placed as a sign on the wall. This statement would be more appropriately addressed to particular people that the speaker perceived talking in the library. Thus, the 'indexical' nature of the statement corresponds to the function of *no*.

- (20) a. Tosyokan de wa sigo o sinai koto  
library in-TOP talk-ACC do not  
'You shouldn't talk in the library.'
- b. Tosyokan de wa sigo o sinai no  
library in-TOP talk-ACC do not  
'Don't talk in the library.'

Teramura (1984: 309) explains the auxiliary *no da* as follows: the speaker uses this expression when she recognizes a certain situation and tries to understand why it is so or to make the hearer understand why it is so. Teramura's analysis corresponds to our observation. All the examples above corroborate our functional account of the 'indexical' nature of *no*, and show that this is a common feature of the complementizer form and the pro-noun form.

## 7. Conclusions

The 'direct' nature of *no* and the 'indirect' nature of *koto* have been observed in the literature. In spite of considerable discussion on this topic, it was not clear where this 'directness' comes from. We have discussed this problem thus far and attempted to show that it comes from the 'indexical' function of the pro-noun *no*. In a strict sense, it should not be called a pro-noun because, unlike English pro-nouns, it cannot be used without other sentential elements. Thus, we should provisionally call it a 'quasi pro-noun.' We have shown that the *no* pro-noun shares fundamental features with the formal noun *mono*. We postulate that it has carried over the 'indexical' function through truncation from *mono*. Based on this hypothesis, we have shown that the 'indexical' function of the *no* pro-noun is observed in the complementizer *no*. The other uses of *no* such as the head-internal relative clause and the auxiliary *no da* all reveal that this functional approach is indeed plausible. Horie (1997) refers to the other expressions, *no ni*, *no de* and *no ga*, in addition to *no*. At this point, we are not certain if we could apply our observation to these words directly. We would like to leave this problem for future investigation.

\* For valuable comments and suggestions, I am grateful to my colleague, Daryl Sherriff. Without his contribution, this paper would not have been completed.

Any shortcomings are, of course, my own.

- 1 The examples shown in this section are from Josephs (1976) unless otherwise stated.
- 2 The original examples are minimally glossed in Josephs (1976), probably for the sake of descriptive simplicity. However, this paper provides morph-by-morph glosses in accordance with LSA practice.
- 3 The verbs *yookyuu suru*, *teian suru*, and *suitei suru*, are called light-verbs. They consist of a verbal noun (VN) and *suru* ‘do.’ These VNs originate in Chinese, where they were used as verbs. When loaned into the Japanese vocabulary, they were lexicalized in conjunction with the verb *suru*, which had tense inflection.
- 4 Note that there are a number of examples in which the referents of *koto* and *mono* are somehow fixed linguistically. For example, *oo mono*, which literally means a ‘big thing,’ refers to a ‘big game’ in a fishing context, and an ‘important figure’ in a context like (7a). It does not refer to anything big in a literal or concrete sense. Another example is *ao mono*, literally a ‘blue/green thing,’ but this expression only designates green vegetables. The referent has been entrenched as such in the language community.
- 5 *Aru* can also take a physical object as its subject in a sentence like *Tukue no ue ni hon ga aru* ‘There is a book on the desk.’ *Dekiru* also takes a physical object as its subject, but in such a case the subject is metonymically used, referring to someone’s ability. Thus, *piano* in the sentence *Naomi wa piano ga dekiru* ‘Naomi is able to play the piano’ refers to the ability to play the piano.
- 6 Nomura (2001) provides a cognitive account of the head-internal relative clauses. He argues that this type of relative clause constructs a metonymic reference-point structure whose active zone and profile do not correspond. See also Kuroda (1999).
- 7 *Desu* is a polite form of *da*. There is no semantic difference besides the former being polite.

## References

- Horie, K. (1990) “How Languages Encode the Cognitive Notion of Directness and Indirectness” *Japanese Korean Linguistics*. (ed.) Hajime Hoji. 61-77. Stanford:

CSLI

- Horie, K. (1997) "Three types of nominalization in Modern Japanese: *no*, *koto*, and *zero*" *Linguistics* 35. 879-894. Walter de Gruyter
- Josephs, L. (1976) "Complementation" *Japanese Generative Grammar* (Syntax and Semantics, vol.5) (ed.) M. Shibatani, 307-370. New York: Academic Press
- Kuno, S. (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1999) "Shubu naizai kankeisetu" in *Kotoba no kaku to shuuhen*. ("Head Internal Relative Clause" in *The Core and Periphery of Language*) Tokyo: Kuroshio
- Langacker, R. (1987) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol.1 California: Stanford University Press
- Langacker, R. (1990) CLR 1. *Concept, Image, and Symbol*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Langacker, R. (1991) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol.2 California: Stanford University Press
- Langacker, R. (2000) CLR 14. *Grammar and Conceptualization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Martin, S. (1975) *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Nomura, M. (2001) "Sanshoten kobun to siteno shuyoobu naizaigata kankeisetu kobun" (The head-internal relative clause as a reference point structure) *Ninchi gengo gaku ronkoo No.1* (Studies in Cognitive Linguistics No.1) 229-255. Hitsuji Shoboo
- Teramura, H. (1984) *Nihongo no syntax to imi II*. (Japanese Syntax and Semantics II) Tokyo: Kuroshio