A Note on NP *no yooni* in Japanese

Naoki Nakajima

1. Introduction

Japanese has a variety of constructions where an NP exemplifies a set of entities designated by another NP. The NP designating a set of entities may not be realized syntactically, but in the core case it is realized as the head of an NP modified by the phrase containing the NP that exemplifies it.[1] I will call these constructions simply *Exemplification* (henceforth *EX*) here, and illustrated below are some cases of EX in Japanese.

(1) a Bideo nado no denka-seihin no ureyuki mo kootyooda.
b Bideo nado denka-seihin no ureyuki mo kootyooda.
'The sales of electrical appliances like videocassette recorders are going well.'

(2) Kaze ni wa orenzi no yoona bitamin C no ooi kudamono ga yoi.
'Fruits like oranges that contain a lot of vitamin C are good for you when you have a cold.'

(3) Zyuusu no kan mitaina moenai mono wa kono hukuro ni irete-kudasai.
'Please put in this bag nonflammable things like soft drink cans.'

(4) a Rainen ni wa Sony, Matsushita toitta oote meekaa mo kono bunya ni sanka site-kuru hazuda.
'Big corporations such as Sony and Matsushita are expected to join this field sometime next year.'
b * Rainen ni wa Sony toitta oote meekaa mo kono bunya ni sanka site-kuru hazuda.

In these examples, two NPs are mediated by a particular lexical item.

They take as their complement an NP designating an entity or a set of entities and form the modifier that semantically exemplifies the head NP.[2] Thus, in (1), for instance, *Bideo* 'videocassette recorders' is a member of the set *denka-seihin* 'electrical appliances.' The same is true of (2)—(4). I will refer to the modifier that exemplifies the head as an *EX phrase* and the modified NP as the *host*.

These lexical items that have the semantic function of EX illustrated above form a small but interesting category. However, they are not homogeneous in their character. They do not, for instance, fall into the same syntactic category. *Nado* in (1) is a particle, and *yoona, mitaina* in (2)—(3) are nominal adjectives (NA). *Toitta* in (4) is less clear but something close to a particle.

They have their own peculiar properties and restrictions imposed on them. An NP or PP within an NP usually must be marked by the genitive case marker *no* as *Bideo nado no denka-seihin* is in (1)a. However, NP *nado* without a genitive case marker *no* is also allowed as is shown in (1)b. *Yoona, mitaina* (and archaic *gotoki*) are all related to the expression of similarity (*hikyoo* in terms of the traditional Japanese linguistics). Nominal adjectives and adjectives typically do not take any complements, and even if they do, their complements are usually not marked by *no*, but the complement of yoona in (2) is exceptionally marked by *no*. Historically, this exceptional property of assigning *no* is due to the fact that the stem *yoo-* was originally a noun, but why the structural case assignment of the genitive case was incorporated into this lexical item as one of its properties when it was reanalyzed as a nominal adjective still remains a mystery. *Toitta* has also interesting restrictions on its complement. The complement must be a coordinated phrase, and thus it is unacceptable if the complement expresses a single entity as in (4)b.

In (1)—(4), the EX phrase appears as the modifier which c-commands its host NP, but this is not the only possibility.

(5) a New York no yoona hanzai no ooi tosi de wa, sore ga zyoosiki ni natte-iru.

b New York no yooni hanzai no ooi tosi de wa, sore ga zyoosiki ni natte-iru.
'Such an understanding is common sense in the cities where crime is prevalent(,) of which New York is a member.'

(5)b has the same meaning as (5)a and *New York* is presented as an example of *hanzai no ooi tosi* 'the cities where crime is prevalent' just like (5)a, but *New York no yooni* is not syntactically a nominal-modifier, but a predicate-modifier, which modifies the predicate AP *hanzai no ooi*.[3] This is evidenced by its inflection, *-ni*, since nominal adjectives have this form only when they appear within the projection of a predicate (i. e., V, A, NA, and probably INFL).

This is striking in the light of its meaning. Since an EX phrase must semantically be associated with a set of entities, it should appear syntactically as a nominal-modifier that is a sister of the host NP that designates a set of entities, and in such a configuration, semantic interpretation of the EX phrase would proceed straightforward.

Since *New York no yooni* is a predicate-modifier in (5)b, however, what is syntactically associated with it is the AP *hanzai no ooi*. Obviously, the AP does not satisfy the semantic requirement of the EX phrase, and we expect *New York no yooni* would not be interpreted as (5)a is, and that an ungrammatical sentence would occur. However, contrary to our expectations, (5)b is perfect with the same meaning as (5)a. There should be no way to derive the meaning of EX compositionally that (5)b has. How is it possible for the predicate-modifying NAP *New York no yooni* to be interpreted as the EX phrase that is semantically associated with the head NP?

In this paper, we will focus upon this NP *no yooni* and examine its peculiar properties. After a brief discussion of EX in section 2, we will examine the properties of NP *no yoooni* and consider a possible analysis in section 3. Now, let us start by clarifying a little more what Exemplification really means.

2. Exemplification

Our discussion so far has been based on an intuitive definition of EX. An NP containing an EX phrase is presented as "a set of entities represented by the NP in the EX phrase," and we considered that the lexical item *yoo-* specifies that *x* (the referent of the complement NP) is a member of the set designated by the host. This account of EX is simple and intuitively understandable, but it is not clear enough, especially in the case of EX NP *no yoo-*, because we have another NP *no yoo-*, which is semantically pretty close to EX NP *no yoo-*. We will refer to this NP *no yoo-* illustrated in (6) as *Similarity* NP *no yoo-*.

(6) a Watasi wa watasi no titi no yoona Yamada-san ga sukida.
'I like Mr. Yamada, who is like my father.'

b Watasi wa anata no yooni (wa) umaku dekinakatta.
'I could not do it as well as you did.'

c Kono nihonsyu wa wain no yooda.
'This sake is like wine.'

The meaning of this NP *no yoo-* is not entirely clear, but it seems to have roughly the meaning of "*x* (the complement NP) is similar to, but distinct from *y* (the host NP)."

One of the differences between these two types of *yoo*-s can be found in what kind of host NPs they are associated with. When the head of an NP designates an entity, the interpretation of NP *no yoo-* is straightforward, because the EX phrase must be associated with a set of entities and not a single entity. In such a case, only Similarity NP *no yoo-* is available. We may say, using the terms of Carlson (1980), EX NP *no yoo-* may only be associated with a *kind*.

Whether NP *no yoo-* is Similarity or EX also depends on whether the host NP is specific or not. If a host NP is specific, then NP *no yoo-* can only be interpreted as Similarity NP *no yoo-*. Proper nouns can never be the host of an EX phrase. This is because the host NP must be a non-specific NP.

Differences between Similarity and EX NP *no yoo-* are not limited to

semantic differences; there is a crucial syntactic difference between these two. Although Similarity NP *no yoo-* appears in any position and serves as a nominal-modifier, predicate-modifier, or predicate as in (6), EX NP *no yoo-* cannot be a predicate. It can appear only in the nominal-modifying position, or predicate-modifying position.

(7) a Sono kettei ni hantai site-iru kuni wa America no yooda.
'It seems that the country which is against the decision is the U. S.'
b Sono kettei ni hantai site-iru kuni wa America nado da.
'Countries against the decision include the U. S. and others.'

(7)a cannot be taken as a case of EX, and can only mean 'It seems that the country which is against the decision is the U. S.' with still another *yoo-*. Probably this is a reflection of the semantic property of EX NP *no yoo-*. EX NP *no yoo-* must be associated with a set of entities at semantic interpretation. This requires that NP *no yoo-* should syntactically appear as a sister of the host NP, but there will be no host NP available if it appears as a predicate.

This fact constitutes the strongest piece of evidence that EX NP *no yoo-* cannot be reduced to Similarity NP *no yoo-*, and seems to indicate that nominal modification is the unmarked syntactic realization of the semantic function of EX. Note incidentally that not all EX phrases are excluded from this position. As is shown in (7)b, NP *nado* is grammatical in this position. EX phrases in general do not appear in the predicate position, so NP *nado* seems to be rather unusual in this respect.[4]

3. An LF Raising Analysis

One of the central issues concerning EX NP *no yooni* involves a mismatch between syntax and semantics. It appears syntactically as a predicate-modifier, but it semantically requires an NP as its host rather than a predicate (VP, AP, etc.). The interpretation of the sentences in which NP *no yooni* occurs cannot be determined compositionally.

One possibility of resolving this mismatch is that NP *no yooni* is der-

ivationally related to NP *no yoona* in syntax. There are two options available to derive an appropriate structure for semantic interpretation. One is the adjunction of NP *no yooni* to the maximal projection of the head NP by Move α, and the other is the lowering of NP *no yoo-* into the predicate-modifying position at S-structure, assuming that EX NP *no yoo-* appears only in the nominal-modifying position at D-structure.

The situation is reminiscent of the recent argument about LF raising of non-quantified NPs by Reinhart (1991). Contrary to the widespread view that quantified and non-quantified NPs should be distinguished in syntax, and that QR only applies to quantified NPs (QNP), Reinhart argues that the application of QR is not limited to QNPs, but that it also applies to non-quantified NPs. In the case of "Exception Conjunction" (8)a, *No linguist* is raised and adjoined to the phrase *except Lucie* by QR to form a constituent at LF.

(8) a No linguist smiled except/but Lucie.
b No linguist except Lucie smiled.
c No linguist smiled, but Lucie smiled. (Lucie a Linguist)

This is necessary to yield the appropriate structure for semantic interpretation, and obtain the interpretation identical to (8)b. Otherwise the phrase *except Lucie* is uninterpretable, and treating (8)a as an ellipsis would lead to the wrong interpretation identical to (8)c, which is a contradiction.

What is raised by QR in (8)a is a QNP, but Reinhart goes further and claims that the same thing is happening to non-quantified NPs in "Bare-Argument Conjunctions" (9)a and "Comparative Ellipsis"(9)b. The object NP *your book* in (9)a and the subject NP *More men* in (9)b, for example, are adjoined to the "remnants," *but not your poem* and *than women*, respectively by QR.

(9) a The critics praised your book yesterday but not your poem.
b More men love Bach than women.

In these cases, too, the ellipsis analysis is infeasible. These constructions have

different syntactic properties from the standard cases of ellipsis. Reinhart argues that the clause that will be interpreted as the predicate which takes the remnant as argument must be a sister of the remnant's constituent at S-structure, and gives the following examples.

(10) a * The fact that some politician has resigned got much publicity but not the defense minister.
b * More rumor that the education minister resigned were spread than the defense minister.

There is no such restriction on the standard cases of ellipsis, and these constructins need a different analysis, the LF raising of a non-quantifier phrase.

Suppose that NP *no yooni* is also a case of LF raising of a non-quantifier phrase. NP *no yooni* is moved out of the phrase whose head it modifies, and adjoined to the maximal projection of the head NP to yield the appropriate structure for semantic interpretation, where the EX phrase is a sister of (or in the mutual c-command relation with) the host NP. Thus, the structure of the NP in question in (5)b is (11)a at S-structure, and at LF it will be (11)b.

(11) a $[_{NP}\ [_{AP}$ New York no yooni hanzai no ooi] tosi]
b $[_{NP}\ [_{NAPi}$ New York no yooni] $[_{NP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i$ hanzai no ooi] tosi]]

NP *no yoo-* appears freely as a predicate, predicate-modifier, or nominal-modifier, but it must be associated with an NP (semantically, those designating a set of entities) to yield an appropriate semantic representation. If it appears as a nominal-modifier, it will satisfy the structural requirement for semantic interpretation, but if it appears as a predicate, there is no NP to be associated with and ungrammatical sentences will result. This is the account suggested in section 2. Under the LF raising analysis, if it appears as a predicate-modifier, it does not satisfy the structural requirement in situ, so it will be raised and adjoined to the NP containing the modifier that contains NP *no yooni*. In this way, the syntactic-semantic mismatch is resolved and

the distribution of NP *no yoo-* will automatically be explained under the LF raising analysis.

Now, what else follows from this analysis? Note there is only one lexical item EX *yoo-* in the lexicon, and any differences between NP *no yoona* and NP *no yooni* must follow from a general principle, or interaction of general principles, under this analysis.

An obvious difference between them is that NP *no yooni* is a predicate-modifier, and there must be some predicate phrase it modifies within an NP. Thus, NP *no yooni* in (12)b is unacceptable without a modidier that modifies the head noun *daitosi*, while NP *no yoona* in (12)a is still acceptable.[5]

(12) a Tokyo no yoona daitosi de sono yoona koto ga okotte mo husigi de wa nai.

b * Tokyo no yooni daitosi de sono yoona koto ga okotte mo husigi de wa nai.

'It wouldn't be a surprise if such a thing happened in large cities like Tokyo.'

The account of this difference is straightforward. The inflection *-ni* is available only in the predicate-modifying position. If the NAP NP *no yoo-* appears with a noun phrase that contains only a noun, it will be in the nominal-modifying position. It will be realized as NP *no yoona* at S-structure and there is no chance to find the inflection *-ni* appearing in such a configuration.

There is also a difference in the interpretation of these two NAPs. NP *no yooni* can only be interpreted as a non-restrictive modifier modifying a generic NP, while NP *no yoona* can serve as a restrictive modifier as well as a non-restrictive modifier. Let us consider the interpretation of (5), repeated here as (13).

(13) a New York no yoona hanzai no ooi tosi de wa, sore ga zyoosiki ni natte-iru.

b New York no yooni hanzai no ooi tosi de wa, sore ga zyoosiki ni natte-iru.

'Such an understanding is common sense in the cities where crime is prevalent(,) of which New York is a member.'

(13)a is ambiguous. If *New York no yoona* in (13)a is a restrictive modifier, the meaning of the NP that contains it will be 'a set of cities like New York where crime is prevalent.' If it is a non-restrictive modifier, the NP will mean 'a set of cities where crime is prevalent in general, which New York is a member of.' On the other hand, in (13)b the NP in question can only have the non-restrictive reading. The restrictive reading of NP *no yoona* can probably be obtained more easily from *Tokyo no yoona daitosi* in (12)a, which lacks any modifier and has the meaning of 'a set of large cities that share some common property with Tokyo.' This "some common property" is syntactically expressed in (13) (i. e., the AP *hanzai no ooi*), but pragmatically supplied in (12)a. It might, for instance, be interpreted as 'a set of large cities that are vulnerable to earthquakes like Tokyo,' when we are discussing in what kind of large cities a certain kind of disaster is likely to happen.

Under the LF raising analysis, this difference in interpretation will also be given a natural account. It is most commonly assumed that the distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive modification is structurally reflected. Let us suppose a modifier that is a sister of N′ is a restrictive modifier and one that is a sister of N″ is a non-restrictive modifier.[6] Now, the fact that NP *no yooni* has only the non-restrictive reading directly follows from one of the properties of move α. Since move α adjoins XP only to XP (Chomsky 1986), there is no way to adjoin XP to X′. This ensures that NP *no yooni* is adjoined only to N″, where only the non-restrictive reading is obtained. Note that this NAP must be in the position where it is the sister of the host NP at LF for semantic interpretation.

We have seen the case of NP *no yooni* serving as the EX phrase, but these NAPs all appear in the underlined position in (14).

(14) $[_{NP}\ [\underline{\quad\quad}XP]\ NP]$

They appear within a nominal modifier XP (AP, NAP, etc.) that modifies the

head NP. However, if the option of LF raising is available, there is no reason to assume that its application is limited to those that appear in the underlined position in (14). In fact, as we expect, this EX phrase appears outside of the NP syntactically as a predicate-modifier with a generic NP as its host. Note that the host NP *Daitosi* does not need any modifier in (15), since the EX phrase NP *no yooni* is not within the NP *Daitosi*.

(15) Daitosi wa New York no yooni hanzai ga ooi.
'Crime is prevalent in large cities like New York.'

(15) indicates that the NP *no yooni* that modifies the main predicate also undergoes LF raising and is adjoined to the topic NP *daitosi* in (15). We might go even further and claim that the LF raising of NP *no yooni* occurs in a wider context than we so far have seen. In all the cases we examined, the host is a generic NP, wherever NP *no yooni* appears. However, the host NP is not limited to generic NPs. Sentences with a universal quantifier show a similar behavior.

(16) a ?? Shinjuku no yooni Tokyo wa hito ga ooi.
'?? Tokyo is crowded like Shinjuku.'
b Shinjuku no yooni Tokyo wa doko mo hito ga ooi.
'In Tokyo, everywhere is crowed like Shinjuku.'
c * Shinjuku no yoona Tokyo wa doko mo hito ga ooi.
'* Everywhere in Tokyo like Shinjuku is crowded.'

It is interesting that in (16)b *doko mo* 'everywhere' drastically changes an unacceptable sentence into a fully acceptable one. In (16)a as well as (16)c, only the interpretation in which the host NP is *Tokyo* is available, because *Shinjuku no yoona* appears as a nominal-modifier in (16)c, and there is no other NP that can be the host in (16)a. Since *Tokyo* is a specific NP, it cannot be interpreted as the host NP of *Shinjuku no yooni* in either case. In (16)b, on the other hand, there is another interpretation available where *doko mo* is the host NP. At the LF of (16)b, *doko mo* moves to the operator

position and binds its trace. The EX phrase is also adjoined to the quantifier and the NP *Shinjuku* of *Shinjuku no yooni* is interpreted as one of the values for the variable bound by the universal quantifier. It is this interpretation that makes (16)b a fully acceptable sentence. Note also that it is only the universal quantifier that makes this interpretation possible, other quantifiers do not provide such an interpretation.

Our analysis also makes a correct prediction about this adjunct NP *no yooni*. If the movement of the EX phrase NP *no yooni* is operated by Move α, it can only move to the position from which it m-commands its trace, and this constraint on movement restricts the possible combinations of an EX phrase and its host NP. Let us consider the case of the adjunct EX NP *no yooni* which is base-generated adjoined to a predicate phrase (AP, NAP, etc.). Let us suppose here that the predicate is an NAP for the sake of argument. If the predicate is transitive, there are two potential host NPs, the subject and object NP. If the subject is the host NP, the EX phrase is adjoined to the subject and from there it m-commands (and antecedent governs) its trace. No violations will occur. On the other hand, if the object is the host NP, the EX phrase will be adjoined to the object, but then it is in the position from which it does not m-command its trace, because there is an NAP (two segments of the category NAP, NAP1 and NAP2) which dominates the EX phrase (YP), but not its trace t_i in the NAP-adjoined position, as illustrated in (17).

(17) $\ldots[_{NAP2}\ t_i\ [_{NAP1}\ldots[_{NP}\ YP_i\ NP]\ldots]\ldots]\ldots$

Thus, our analysis predicts such a case is ungrammatical. This prediction is born out, as illustrated in (18).

(18) a Kare wa tyokoreeto no yooni amai mono ga daisukida.
b *Kare wa tyokoreeto no yooni mono ga daisukida.
c *Kare wa tyokoreeto no yooni okasi ga daisukida.
d Kare wa tyokoreeto no yoona okasi ga daisukida.
'He loves sweets like chocolate.'

At first, (18)a appears to be the wrong result, but it is structurally ambiguous. The EX phrase *tyokoreeto no yooni* can be considered as a predicate-modifier either outside of the NP or within the AP. If the EX phrase is within the nominal-modifying AP, it will be adjoined to the NP *amai mono* at LF and the grammatical (18)a will result. If the EX phrase is outside of the NP *amai mono*, it cannot take the object NP *amai mono* as its host, because it does not m-command its trace at LF. (18)a has the structure in which the EX phrase appears within the AP, and thus it is grammatical. Now, recall that the host of this type of NP *no yooni* does not need any modifier XP, since the EX phrase is not within the host NP (cf. (15)). This difference would distinguish these two structures. We can disambiguate (18)a by removing the modifier *amai*, and the resulting structure will be (18)b, in which the EX phrase appears in the position adjoined to the NAP *mono ga daisukida*. As is predicted, (18)b is unacceptable. One might think this unacceptability is due to the fact that the object *mono* 'thing' does not have enough semantic content. However, replacing the object noun *mono* with an ordinary noun *okasi* 'sweet' would not improve the sentence. (18)c is no better than (18)b. The ungrammaticality of (18)c (and (18)b) proves that our analysis makes a correct prediction.

4. Some Problems

We have seen the peculiarities of EX NP *no yooni* and presented the possibility of an LF raising analysis. This analysis accounts for three basic properties of EX NP *no yoo-* quite naturally. EX NP *no yoo-* appears in the predicate-modifying position despite its semantic nature requiring nominal modification. There is asymmetry of NP *no yoona* and NP *no yooni* in interpretation, i. e., NP *no yooni* has only the non-restrictive reading. The latter can be explained by a general property of Move α. It can also be explained that EX NP *no yoo-* will not appear as a main predicate, provided that the LF raising from this position is generally prohibited. This, however, is only a brief sketch of an LF raising analysis, and its exact consequences need to be fully worked out.

Although such an analysis is certainly interesting and has significant

theoretical implications, it is not without problems. For instance, since the EX phrase can appear as a nominal-modifier or predicate-modifier, we might expect a situation whereby a host NP is modified both by NP *no yoona* and NP *no yooni*. This possibility, however, is not allowed as shown in (19).

(19) a *Yamada-san no yoona syoosyaman no yooni tenkin no ooi hito
'*People who are often transferred like a trading company employee like Mr. Yamada.'
b *Syoosyaman no yoona Yamada-san no yooni tenkin no ooi hito
'*People who are often transferred like Mr. Yamada like a trading company employee.'

The present analysis provides no explantation for (19). However, the most serious problem of the analysis presented above is that the meaning of EX can be derived in another way. Let us now reconsider the meaning of EX NP *no yooni* and see the possibility of a completely different analysis. We have argued that EX NP *no yoo-* is different from Similarity NP *no yoo-* in that EX *yoo-* can semantically only be associated with a set of entities and that these two have different meanings. EX *yoo-* was supposed to have the meaning of roughly "*x* (the complement NP) is a member of the set designated by the host NP," while the meaning of Similarity *yoo-* is something like "*x* (the complement NP) is similar to, but distinct from *y* (the head NP)." Based on this, we can conclude that two readings should be different when the head NP is interpreted as a set of entities.

However, there are sentences that might show that Similarity *yoo-* does not have "*x* is distinct from *y*" in its meaning.

(20) a Higaisya wa donki no yoona mono de nagurareta rasii.
'The victim seems to have been hit with something like a blunt instrument.'
b Anata no yooni rippana kata ga sonna koto o suru nante!
'(I cannot believe) a respectable person like you could do such a thing.'

In these sentences, *donki no yoona mono* 'something like a blunt instrument' in (20)a and *Anata no yooni rippana kata* 'a respectable person like you' in (20)b do not seem to be distinct from *donki* 'a blunt instrument' and *Anata* 'you' respectively. We might argue that (20) is a case of EX with the meaning "a set of entities" weakened and narrowed down virtually to "a set of a single entity."

This case, however, can also be considered as a case of Similarity *yoo-* and we could argue that Similarity *yoo-* does not have "*x* is distinct from *y*" in its meaning, but rather it is pragmatically supplied. In sentences like (21), it is natural to consider that "*x* is distinct from *y*" is pragmatically derived.

(21) Atarasii gakkoo de mo anata no yoona ii tomodati o mituketai to omotte-iru.
'I hope I can find (a) good friend(s) like you at my new school.'

If this is correct, it will be the case that Similarity NP *no yooni* virtually have the meaning of exemplification. Now, the case of NP *no yooni* that we have seen can be considered as a case of Similarity *yoo-* rather than of EX.

This would lead us to the reconsideration of the distribution of the EX phrase. We have so far assumed that the EX phrase NP *no yoo-* appears in the following three positions.

(22) a [____NP]
b [[____XP] NP]
c [...[____XP]...] (X=A, NA, V)

As we have already seen, there is strong syntactic evidence that EX NP *no yoo-* at least appears in (22)a. Although it does not seem implausible that EX NP *no yoo-* might be semantically reduced to Similarity NP *no yoo-*, the fact that the EX phrase cannot appear as a main predicate strongly suggests that it cannot be reduced to Similarity NP *no yoo-* completely, if our observation about (7)a is correct. It is implausible that this fact can be explained by pragmatic considerations.

However, the situation is less obvious in (22)b and (22)c. They may be a case of Similarity NP *no yoo-* rather than EX. It may be the case that when the host (and Similarity NP *no yoo-*) is interpreted as a generic NP, the NP in Similarity NP *no yoo-* is interpreted virtually as an NP that exemplifies the host NP under the influence of the generic operator. The above discussion will not undermine the LF raising analysis, but we may have to distinguish the EX NP *no yooni* that undergoes the LF-movement from the one whose semantic function is derived pragmatically.

5. Concluding Remarks

In this note, we have taken up EX NP *no yooni* and examined its properties. The central issue here is the mismatch between syntax and semantics, and there are two approaches to this issue. One possibility is that we argue that EX NP *no yooni* is syntactically related to EX NP *no yoona* by either Move α or syntactic restructuring. We have given a brief sketch of the former analysis, and the latter is still another possibility left open, though it seems to be less plausible with the LF raising analysis as an alternative. The other possibility is that we consider this NP *no yooni* as a case of Similarity rather than EX, and argue that Similarity NP *no yoo-* has virtually the semantic function of "EX" in some contexts. This is not feasible since EX NP *no yoo-* cannot be reduced to Similarity NP *no yoo-* completely. However, if this is correct with respect to NP *no yooni* that appears in (22)b and/or (22)c, we need to further distinguish the real EX and the virtual EX NP *no yoo-*, which is derived from Similarity NP *no yoo-*. The distribution of EX NP *no yoo-* will be the question that immediately comes out.

We have not presented the full details of the LF raising analysis, but since EX NP *no yoo-* has not been discussed so much in the literature, I believe it to be a good preliminary step to show some interesting properties of EX NP *no yoo-* and clarify the issues that are involved in this construction. Further investigations based on a detailed semantic analysis will shed light on the peculiar properties of this construction and may bring up still more interesting theoretical issues.

Notes

1. "The NP designating a set of entities" here does not necessarily mean the maximal projection of the NP, when it is realized as the head of an NP modified by the EX phrase. I will not make use of the bar-notation and simply use the "NP" for both N' and N" unless it causes a confusion. See the discussion of the restrictive and non-restrictive EX phrase in Section 3.
2. What I will call "an entity" or "a set of entities" here correspond to "Thing" (and probably "Place") in the ontological categories of Jackendoff (1983). Whether or not the host NP is limited to only these two ontological categories needs further investigation.
3. The phrase *hanzai no ooi* may be an IP or CP, but this is irrelevant to our discussion here.
4. An account which immediately comes to mind is that NP *nado* allows an empty NP as its host, while other EX phrase do not allow this possibility. I will leave the matter for the future reseach.
5. (12)b is unacceptable with the intended structure [$_{NP}$Tokyo no yooni daitosi], because of the wrong inflection *-ni*. If *Tokyo no yooni* is considered as a predicate-modifier which appears outside of the NP, the sentence may be acceptable. See the discussion in Section 4.
6. See Kamio (1983) for the argument for structurally distinguishing restrictive and non-restrictive modifiers in Japanese. We will assume that N″ is the maximal projection of N.

Reference

Carlson, G. (1980) *Reference to Kinds in English*, New York : Garland Publishing Inc.

Chomsky, N. (1986) *Barriers*, Cambridge, Mass. : MIT Press.

Imanishi, N. (1994) "A Note on *Except*-Constructions in English," in S. Chiba et al. eds., *Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Language*, 379-390, Tokyo : Liber Press.

Jackendoff, R. (1983) *Semantics and Cognition*, Cambridge, Mass. : MIT Press.

Kamio, A. (1983) "Meishiku no Koozoo," in K. Inoue ed., *Nihongo no Kihon Koozoo I*, 77-126, Tokyo : Sanseido.

Kitahara, Y. (1972) "Hikyo no Jodooshi," in Suzuki and Hayashi eds., *Jodooshi II*, 112-132, Tokyo : Meijishoin.

Kitahara, Y. (1984) *Nihongo Bunpoo no Shooten*, Tokyo : Taishukan.

Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyusho (1951) *Gendaigo no Joshi-Jodooshi*, Tokyo : Shuei-shuppan.

Martin, S. (1988) *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*, Tokyo : Charles E. Tuttle Company.

Morita, Y. (1989) *Kiso Nihongo Jiten*, Tokyo : Kadokawa.

Nagano, K. (1969) "Hikyoo no Jodooshi 2 Yooda—Hikyoo ‹Gendaigo›," in A. Muramatsu ed., *Kotengo Gendaigo Joshi Jodooshi shoosetu*, 313-318, Tokyo : Gakutoosha.

Nakajima, N. (1993) "Reiji no 'Yoona/Gotoki' no Haseiteki Yoohoo ni tsuite," in *Sofutouea Bunsho no tame no Nihongo Shori no Kenkyu* 12, 157-189, Joohoo-shori Shinkoo Jigyoo Kyookai.

Reinhart, T. (1991) "Elliptic Conjunctions—Non-Quantificational LF," in A. Kasher ed., *The Chomskyan Turn*, 360-384, Oxford : Blackwell.

Sakata, Y. and Y. Kuramochi (1993) *Bunpoo II*, Kyooshiyoo Nihongo Kyooiku Handobukku 4, Tokyo : Bonjinsha.