

## Concealed Sentential Complement of an Informational Transferring Construction

Objects of Japanese transitive verbs are typically marked with the accusative case *-o* (1). However Kinjo and Sasaguri (1999) observe that verbs of information transfer, such as *hanasu* (talk), *kaku* (write), *kiku* (hear), *oshieru* (teach), *tazuneru* (ask) do not allow accusative marked proper names as their objects (2a). Proper names require the genitive marker *-no* along with the formal noun *koto* (2b). This syntactic peculiarity has a semantic counterpart: information transferring constructions show intensional properties, contrary to other transitive constructions. Empty proper names (*Pegasus*) do not induce falsity (3), and substitution of co-referring terms (*Mori Ogai* and *Rintaro Mori*) may change the truth conditions (4). These facts raise interesting puzzles: how is the NP-*no koto* form derived and why does the presence of *-no koto* induce intensionality? In this paper, I argue that the NP-*no koto* construction has a concealed IP and that intensionality arises from this clause. Specifically I propose that the genitive marked NP is in fact the subject of the concealed IP and NP-*no koto* is a remnant of IP deletion. I explore the consequence of this analysis in other Altaic languages, where deletion of a sentential noun complement shows systematic correlation with the occurrence of genitive case.

Harada (1971) observes that Japanese allows nominative-genitive case conversion: the nominative case *-ga* within the sentential complement of N (5a) optionally changes to the genitive case *-no* (5b). Ochi (2001) further argues that genitive phrases in such constructions optionally moves to DP spec in overt syntax (6a). When its content is recoverable from the context, such IPs can be deleted, stranding the genitive marked subject (6b). I argue that same operations are involved in the derivation of the NP-*no koto* phrase. The formal noun *koto* takes a sentential complement, whose subject can be marked with the nominative (7a) or genitive case (7b). When marked with the genitive case, it may overtly raise to DP spec (8a). When the content is recoverable from the context, IP can be deleted as (8b), and the NP-*no koto* form is derived.

The ellipsis analysis of NP-*no koto* phrase explains the intuition of Kinjo and Sasaguri (1999) and Takubo, Sasaguri and Kinjo (2003) that the NP-*no koto* phrase is sensitive to the context and refers to an event in which its subject participates. This analysis also explains the presence of intensional properties. According to the sententialist approach (McCawley 1974, Ross 1976, den Dikken, Larson and Ludlow 1996), intensionality arises strictly with sentential complementation. In the NP-*no koto* construction, the intensionality is expected to arise from the elided IP. Finally, this analysis explains an otherwise puzzling distribution of temporal adverbs. Temporal adverbs typically cannot modify proper names (9), but can co-occur with proper names in the informational transferring construction (10). Assuming that genitive marked temporal modifiers are also generated within IP and move to DP spec (11), the IP ellipsis analysis correctly predicts that a temporal modifier can appear with proper names only in the informational transferring constructions.

Beyond facts specific to Japanese, this analysis implies a broad correlation between case and ellipsis that appears to be verified in other Altaic languages. Specifically, the possibility of elliptical constructions like Japanese NP-*no koto* is predicted to correlate with the presence of nominative-genitive case conversion. Turkish requires the subject of sentential complements to bear genitive case. It has no formal noun equivalent to *koto*, but does have contentful nouns selecting sentential complements (12a). As in Japanese, when the content is recoverable, deletion of the sentential complement can occur, and the genitive subject can be stranded (12b). Korean contains a formal noun *kes*, which takes a sentential complement like Japanese *koto*. However, Korean lacks nominative-genitive case conversion (13a). Revealingly, NP-GEN *kes* form is disallowed (13b). The case of contentful nouns in Korean is slightly more complex. Although subjects of sentential noun complements do not bear genitive case (14a), NP-GEN N is nonetheless allowed (14b). I argue that such examples do not involve IP ellipsis, and that the NP-GEN element is in fact an argument of the contentful noun (cf. *a rumor of/about John*). The correctness of this view is supported by the independence of such examples from context, and by the interpretation of temporal adverbs.

- (1) John-ga Mary-o tataita. (2) a.\*John-ga Mary-o kiita. b. John-ga Mary-no koto-o kiita.  
 John-nom Mary-acc hit John-nom Mary-acc heard John-nom Mary-gen FN-acc heard  
 'John hit Mary.' 'John heard about Mary.' 'John heard about Mary.'
- (3) John-ga Pegasasu-no koto-o kiita. [T/F] (4) John-ga Mori Ogai/Mori Rintaro-no koto-o kiita.  
 John-nom Pegasus-gen FN-acc heard John-nom Mori Ogai/Mori Rintaro-gen FN-acc heard  
 'John heard about Pegasus.' 'John heard about Mori Ogai/Rintaro Mori.'
- (5) a. John-ga [<sub>DP</sub>[<sub>IP</sub>Mary-ga konyakushita] hanashi]-o kiita.  
 John-nom Mary-nom engaged story-acc heard  
 b. John-ga [<sub>DP</sub>Mary-no konyakushita hanashi]-o kiita.  
 John-nom Mary-gen engaged story-acc heard  
 'John heard the story that Mary got engaged.'
- (6) a. [<sub>DP</sub> Mary-no [<sub>IP</sub> t konyakushita ] hanashi]  
 ↑  
 b. [<sub>DP</sub> Mary-no [<sub>IP</sub> t konyakushita] hanashi]  
 Mary-gen engaged story  
 'the story that Mary got engaged.'
- (7) a. John-ga [<sub>NP</sub>[<sub>IP</sub> Mary-ga konyakushita] koto]-o kiita.  
 John-nom Mary-nom engaged FN-acc heard  
 b. John-ga [<sub>NP</sub>[<sub>IP</sub> Mary-no konyakushita] koto]-o kiita.  
 John-nom Mary-gen engaged FN-acc heard  
 'John heard the issue that Mary got engaged.'
- (8) a. John-ga [<sub>NP</sub> Mary-no [<sub>IP</sub> t konyakushita] koto]-o kiita.  
 John-nom Mary-gen engaged FN-acc heard  
 b. John-ga [<sub>NP</sub> Mary-no [<sub>IP</sub> t konyakushita] koto]-o kiita.  
 John-nom Mary-gen engaged FN-acc heard  
 'John heard the issue that Mary got engaged.'
- (9) \*John-ga [kinou-no Mary-o] tataita. (10) John-ga [kinou-no Mary-no koto]-o kiita.  
 John-nom yesterday-gen Mary-acc hit John-nom yesterday-gen Mary-gen FN-acc heard  
 'John hit yesterday's Mary.' 'John heard about what Mary did yesterday.'
- (11) John-ga [kinou-no Mary-no [<sub>IP</sub> t t V] koto]-o kiita.  
 ↑ ↑  
 John-nom Mary-gen engaged FN-acc heard
- (12) a. John [Ali-nin evlen-dig-i iddia-sin]-i duymus. [Turkish]  
 John(-nom) Ali-gen marry-Nind-3sg claim-CMPMD-acc heard  
 'John heard the claim that Ali got married.'  
 b. John [Ali-nin evlen-dig-i iddia-sin]-i duymus.  
 John(-nom) Ali-gen marry-Nind-3sg claim-CMPMD-acc heard (Ebru Piji, Serkan Sener p.c.)
- (13) a. Chelswu-nun [Yenghi-ka/\*uy keik-ul mek-ess-ta-nun kes]-ul tul-ess-ta. [Korean]  
 Chelswu-top Yenghi-nom/\*gen cake-acc eat-pst-dc-RCL FN -acc hear-pst-dc  
 'Chelswu heard (the issue) that Yenghi ate the cake.'  
 b. \*Chelswu-nun [Yenghi-uy kes]-ul tul-ess-ta.  
 Chelswu-top Yenghi-gen FN -acc hear-pst-dc  
 'Chelswu heard the issue that Yenghi ate the cake.' (Yunju Suh p.c.)
- (14) a. Chelswu-nun [Yenghi-ka/\*uy keik-ul mek-ess-ta-nun] somwun]-ul tul-ess-ta.  
 Chelswu-top Yenghi-nom/\*gen cake-acc eat-pst-dc-RCL rumor-acc hear-pst-dc  
 'Chelswu heard the rumor that Yenghi ate the cake.'  
 b. Chelswu-nun [Yenghi-uy somwun]-ul tul-ess-ta.  
 Chelswu-top Yenghi-gen rumor-acc hear-pst-dc  
 'Chelswu heard Yenghi's rumor.' (Yunju Suh p.c.)