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1 Introduction

Regardless of the differences in theoretical frameworks employed, researchers of natural language syntax have assumed that notions such as 'complement' and 'adjunct' play an essential role in describing syntactic regularities of English and other languages of the world.

Larson (1988: p.169), for instance, states that "[m]ost theories of grammar draw a fundamental distinction between arguments and adjuncts. The former are phrases selected by some predicate; the latter are phrases which are unselected, and which function as 'modifiers'."

While Larson's terminology here is somewhat confused, 1 what he suggests is nonetheless a truism: the distinction between 'complements' and 'adjuncts', or 'arguments' and 'modifiers', has been a key concept underlying most theories of grammar. It has been given an increased importance in theoretical studies of natural language syntax in the 1980's, when discussions concerning 'argument structures', which dictate what sort of 'arguments' a given lexical entry would demand for its syntactic projections to be grammatical, became a central issue in syntactic descriptions of natural languages.

Although data concerning English strongly suggest that this distinction is a real and important one for a proper description of English grammar, it does not automatically ensure that the same distinction is significant in describing Japanese syntax.

In this note I will focus my attention on the following question: how can one distinguish 'complements' and 'adjuncts' in Japanese? I will raise several theoretical questions, pointing out relevant examples, with no definitive answers.

2 Complements and Adjuncts in English

In discussing syntax of English, several criteria have often been suggested for establishing the distinction between 'complements' and 'adjuncts'. For instance, Larson (1988: p. 169) notes that "'[a]d junctions and arguments are typically identified empirically according to a number of criteria, two major ones being optionality and iterability." 2
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Thus, the fact that (1, b) is ungrammatical while (1, a) is grammatical suggests that Mary, or the NP that dominates this word, is a complement to the verb loves, whereas both sentences in (2, a) and (2, b) are grammatical, suggesting that enthusiastically is an adjunct rather than a complement.

(1) a. John loves Mary.
    b. *John loves.
(2) a. John runs enthusiastically.
    b. John runs.

Iterability, or possibility of iteration of the same syntactic element, rather than iteration of the same string of words, is sometimes considered to be a factor that distinguishes complements and adjuncts. Thus, ungrammaticality of the sentence in (3, b) seems to suggest that the NP following the verb loves, namely Mary, is its complement rather than its adjunct, while acceptability of (4, b) would be considered to be a factor that indicates that the PPs in question, in the morning as well as during the summer, function as adjuncts rather than complements to the verb runs.

(3) a. John loves Mary.
    b. *John loves Mary that boy.
(4) a. John runs in the morning.
    b. John runs in the morning during the summer.

Sometimes, partially semantic considerations might come into play, such as considerations as to what constitutes the minimal domain for do so-proverbalization. It has often been suggested that interpretation of do so is sensitive to the syntactic structure of its antecedent verb phrase.

For instance, (5, b) can only mean that "Bill put the vase on the table", whatever "the vase" may be. Thus, (5, c) is unacceptable, unless both 'the table' and 'Bill' were located on 'the desk' in the situation described.

(5) a. John put the vase on the table.
    b. Bill did so, too.
    c. *Bill did so on the desk.

On the other hand, (6, b) can be understood to mean either that "Bill kissed Mary" or that "Bill kissed Mary in the garden". Thus, the sentence in (6, c) is acceptable in English, meaning that "Bill kissed Mary in the kitchen."

(6) a. John kissed Mary in the garden.
    b. Bill did so, too.
    c. Bill did so in the kitchen.

This difference in pro-verb interpretation is sometimes attributed to the difference in the syntactic status of the PPs involved, i.e. that on the table in (5, a) is a complement whereas in the garden in (6, a) is an adjunct.

A more interesting distinction is claimed from a slightly different point of view. Very often, we find that dislocation of elements from within an adjunct is more difficult than that from within a complement. Thus, (7, b) is markedly worse than (7, a). 3
(7) a. Who do you think John said that Mary killed ___?
b. *Who do you think John was running in the park when Mary killed ___?

These considerations combine to convince us that there are certainly reasonable ground for distinguishing ‘complements’ and ‘adjuncts’ in English, at least in the case of verbs.

3 Complements and Adjuncts in Japanese

When discussing grammatical descriptions of Japanese syntax, it is sometimes assumed, without sufficient argumentation one way or the other, that such postpositional phrases that are marked with ga, o and ni are complements whereas other postpositional phrases are adjuncts, or sentence modifiers. It is not always easy, however, to make a comparable distinction in Japanese, even in the case of verbs.

For instance, every ‘complement PP’ in Japanese is ‘optional’ in the sense that they can be omitted from any construction without making the resulting sentence ungrammatical. This is a most well-known fact about Japanese, although transformational grammarians might want to claim that there are ‘traces’ for these ‘deleted’ elements. Thus, all of the strings given in (8) are acceptable sentences in Japanese, given proper contexts.

(8) a. Taro-ga Hanako-ni hana-o okutta.
b. Hanako-ni hana-o okutta.
c. Taro-ga hana-o okutta.
d. Taro-ga Hanako-ni okutta.
e. Taro-ga okutta.
f. Hanako-ni okutta.
g. hana-o okutta.
h. okutta.

Taro-SBJ Hanako-IOB flower-OBJ sent

‘Complements’ in Japanese are ‘optional’ in the sense just described. However, it might be argued that iterability of elements could serve as a criterion to distinguish between complements and adjuncts in Japanese. For instance, it is difficult to construct acceptable sentences with more than one occurrence of ga-marked or o-marked PPs, as can be seen in (9), whereas phrases referring to time or place could be easily iterated, as is exemplified in (10).

   Taro-SBJ Hanako-SBJ came
b. *Taro-ga Hanako-o Megumi-o nagutta.
   Taro-SBJ Hanako-OBJ Megumi-OBJ hit

(10) a. Taro-ga kino yugata kita.
   Taro-SBJ yesterday evening came
b. Taro-ga Hanako-o tuyoku hagesiku yusutta.
   Taro-SBJ Hanako-OBJ strongly fervently shook

There are a couple of exceptions to this observation. First, iteration of putative 'complements' are possible in cases where reduction of juxtaposition, or 'coordinately conjoined structures' without any conjoining words, is involved. 6

For instance, (11, a) is a perfectly reasonable thing to say in Japanese. A similar reduction occurs in English too, however, as in (11, b), so this does not really count as a counter-example against the 'iteration' criterion.

(11) a. Taro-wa Hanako-o, Ziro-wa Emiko-o nagutta.
   Taro-SBJ Hanako-OBJ Ziro-SBJ Emiko-OBJ hit
   Taro hit Hanako and Ziro Emiko.

b. John gave a record to Susan and a book to Mary.

Iteration of ga-subjects seems to make the sentence bad, as can be seen in (12, b), but strangely enough, another occurrence of a ga-marked subject seems to make the string better, as can be seen in (12, c). In this case, some sort of 'listing' interpretation seems to be invoked, so this is more like a 'conjunction reduction' case and may not constitute a very good counter-example. This suggestion is further verified by the fact that (12, d) is also a reasonable utterance in Japanese. 7

(12) a. Taro-ga aruku.
   Taro-SBJ walk

   Taro-SBJ Hanako-SBJ walk

c. ?Taro-ga, Hanako-ga, Saburo-ga, aruku.
   Taro-SBJ Hanako-SBJ Saburo-SBJ walk

d. Taro-ga, sono-yoko-o Hanako-ga, aruku.
   Taro-SBJ by-his-side Hanako-SBJ walk
   Taro walks and by his side Hanako (walks).

The above examples of iterated subjects may be cases where reduction of juxtaposed sentences are involved; thus they may not pose a serious problem for the claim that complements do not 'iterate'. However, we can think of the following sort of sentences.

(13) ?Taro-wa Hanako-ni sono-tegami-o gakko-ate-ni okutta.
   Taro-SBJ Hanako-GOAL the-letter-THEME school-GOAL sent
   Taro sent the letter to Hanako in care of the school.

Here we have two ni-marked PPs. One could always argue that the two PPs have different 'thematic roles' and therefore, this does not count as an example of complement iteration. In fact, one is a simple ni-phrase while the other is an ate-ni-phrase, the latter being a fairly good candidate for an 'adjunct'. However, we have here another case where 'iteration' of 'complements' seems to be allowed.

To sum up, those putative criteria for distinguishing complements and adjuncts that worked rather well for English do not work out very clearly in the case of Japanese.
4 Dislocation in Japanese

In the case of English, whether or not an element is allowed to be extracted from within a
given construction depends on the 'complementhood' and/or 'adjuncthood' of various constituents
involved. However, a similar syntactic distinction is rather difficult to establish in the case
of Japanese. Whether or not dislocation of elements from within a given clause makes the
resulting string acceptable in Japanese depends on particular lexical items involved, and also
on the semantic and/or pragmatic content of the whole sentence.

4.1 Dislocation from Within Simple Sentences

It is rather difficult to clarify the difference between 'complements' and 'adjuncts' on the basis of
data regarding dislocation in the case of Japanese.

First, let's see what happens when elements are dislocated from a simple sentence. We see
that contrary to what has sometimes been suggested in the transformational literature on this
question, dislocation of elements are possible even when the postpositions involved are other
than ga, o or ni. However, we find that dislocation of elements that are 'marked' with yori is
definitively unacceptable. 8

Dislocation of ga-marked subjects is possible, both for topicalization as in (14, b) and for
relativization as in (14, c), although ga and wa cannot occur consecutively, as is indicated by the
ungrammaticality of (14, b')

    this-director-SBJ Bladerunner-OBJ directed
b. Bladerunner-wa kono-kantoku-ga totta.
b'. *Kono-kantoku-ga-wa Bladerunner-o totta.
c. [Bladerunner-o totta] kantoku
    the director that directed Bladerunner

The same pattern can be found for verbs (or 'keiyo-dosi') which take two ga-marked phrases
as their 'complements'. Thus, all sentences in (15) are acceptable, except for (15, b) and (15, b'),
where ga-wa concatenation occurs, which is disallowed in Japanese.

(15) a. Ken-wa ringo-ga sukida.
    Ken-SBJ apple-THEME like
    Ken likes apples.
a'. ringo-wa Ken-ga sukida.
    apple-TOPIC Ken-SBJ like
    It is Ken that likes apples.
b. *Ken-ga-wa ringo-ga sukida.
b'. *ringo-ga-wa Ken-ga sukida.
c. [Ken-ga sukina] ringo
    apples, which Ken likes
c'. [ringo-ga sukina] Ken
    Ken, who likes apples
Just as *ga-wa* concatenation is disallowed, so *o-wa* concatenation makes the sentence involved ungrammatical in Japanese. Apart from this restriction, all dislocation in (16) and (17) are possible, although the 'semantic roles' of the *o*-marked phrases are, arguably, different in (16) and in (17).

Ken-SBJ this-book-OBJ read
b. kono-hon-wa Ken-ga yonda.  
b'. *kono-hon-o-wa Ken-ga yonda.
c. [Ken-ga yonda] hon  
the book that Ken read

Ken-SBJ every-morning this-park-THEME take-a-walk
b. kono-koen-wa Ken-ga mai-asa sampo-suru.  
b'. *kono-koen-o-wa Ken-ga mai-asa sampo-suru.
c. [Ken-ga mai-asa sampo-suru] koen  
the park in which Ken takes a walk every morning

Thus, dislocation of postpositional phrases marked with *ga* and *o* is unproblematic, regardless of their 'thematic roles', as far as *ga-wa* or *o-wa* concatenation is not involved. In these examples, topicalization had only one form, because concatenation of *ga* or *o* with *wa* is disallowed.

When we have postpositions other than *ga* or *o*, we have to consider two cases for topicalization. Most of the topicalized sentences where the original postpositions are retained seem acceptable, and grammaticality of those in which the original postpositions are omitted seems to correspond with that of relativized sentences. This is a reasonable consequence if we assume that acceptability of these sentences is largely determined by how ‘recoverable’ the meaning of the omitted postposition is from the context.

For instance, sentences in (18) are all acceptable, which might be a rather striking result for those who are not familiar with languages like Japanese.

(18) a. Ken-wa kono-kaisya-kara syarei-o moratteiru  
Ken-SBJ from-this-company fee-OBJ have-received
b. kono-kaisya-wa Ken-ga syarei-o moratteiru.  
b'. kono-kaisya-kara-wa Ken-ga syarei-o moratteiru.
c. [Ken-ga syarei-o moratteiru] kaisya  
the company from which Ken has received fee

Dislocation of 'possessives' are also possible, as can be seen from the sentences in (19, b) and (19, c). It is rather difficult to see whether (19, b') is possible in the intended sense, because *no* can function as 'possessive pro-noun phrase', and (19, b') may be an example of this. Either way, (19, b') is a bit awkward in comparison with (19, b).

Dislocation and omission of the relevant postposition is marginally possible even when the postposition designates 'reason' or 'cause' of an event or action. Thus, topicalization in which de is omitted, as in (20, b), is unacceptable for most speakers of Japanese. However, topicalization in which the postposition de is retained, as shown in (20, b'), is grammatical. (20, c) is a bit problematic. The sentence itself is admittedly awkward or rather vague in meaning. Moreover, it is rather difficult to get the sentence in the intended sense, namely (21, a), because the string itself is acceptable if the intended meaning is something like (21, b). However, another complication is that sentence like (20, c') is a perfectly reasonable thing to say for the intended sense of (21, a). So we cannot simply say that relativization and topicalization of the phrase in question is not allowed in Japanese on the basis of examples like (20, b) or (20, c).

(20) a. Ken-ga/wa kono-ziken-de daigaku-o zisyoku-sita.
   Ken-SBJ because-of-this-incident university-OBJ resigned
b. *kono-ziken-wa Ken-ga daigaku-o zisyoku-sita.
b'. kono-ziken-de-wa Ken-ga daigaku-o zisyoku-sita.
c. *[Ken-ga daigaku-o zisyoku-sita] ziken
c'. *[Ken-ga daigaku-o zisyoku-suru-koto-ni-natta] ziken
   the incident because of which Ken later had to resign from the university

(21) a. the incident because of which Ken had to resign from the university
b. the incident in which Ken resigned from the university

An example where dislocation is clearly ruled out is given below. We cannot have sentences of the form in (22, b) or (22, c), although sentences of the form in (22, b'), where the postposition yori is retained, are acceptable.

(22) a. Ken-wa ringo-ga kono-kudamono-yori sukida.
   Ken-SBJ apple-THEME than-this-fruit like (prefer)
b. *kono-kudamono-wa Ken-wa ringo-ga sukida.
b'. kono-kudamono-yori-wa Ken-wa ringo-ga sukida.
c. *[Ken-ga ringo-ga sukina] kudamono
   the fruit that Ken prefers apples to

An interesting case is where de for 'means of transportation' is involved. When the following sentences were discussed in a JPSG-WG session at ICOT, some of the participant claimed that (23, b) and (23, c) are both ungrammatical, while some others claimed that (23, c) is acceptable, whereas (23, b) is unacceptable. Those who felt that the sentence in (23, c) is not grammatical agreed that it is better than those in (22, b) and (22, c), where dislocation of a yori-marked phrase is involved.
To sum up, although the extreme cases like sentences involving postposition yori might suggest that we could differentiate 'complements' and 'adjuncts' on the basis of whether dislocation are allowed for these elements, a closer look reveals that this again is not a very decisive criterion for the Japanese language with respect to the distinction in question.

4.2 Dislocation from within Embedded Clauses

Dislocation from within embedded clauses pattern the same with that from simple sentences for the most part. The examples that follow correspond to the ones in the previous section, except for ga/wa alterations that are needed in some cases.

Except for the impossibility of ga-wa concatenation, dislocation of subjects and objects of embedded sentences is unproblematic, both for topicalization and relativization. Examples in (24) are cases where the embedded subject is extracted. Examples in (25) show that extraction of either of the ga-marked 'complements' of sukida is possible, as should be expected.

    [this-director-sbj Bladerunner-o obj directed] comp Hanako-sbj think
c. [[Bladerunner-o totta] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] kantoku
    the director who Hanako thinks directed Bladerunner

(25) a. [Ken-wa ringo-ga sukida] to Hanako-wa omotteiru
    [Ken-sbj apple-theme like] comp Hanako-sbj think
    Hanako thinks that Ken likes apples.
a'. [ringo-wa Ken-ga sukida] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
    Hanako thinks that it is Ken who likes apples.
b. ringo-wa [Ken-ga sukida] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
    As for apples, Hanako thinks that Ken likes them.
b'. Ken-wa [ringo-ga sukida] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
    As for Ken, Hanako thinks that he likes apples.
c. [[Ken-ga sukida] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] ringo
    apples, which Hanako thinks that Ken likes
    apples, which Hanako thinks Ken likes
    apples, which Hanako thinks Ken likes
    apples, which Hanako thinks Ken likes

    Similarly, extraction of o-marked postpositional phrases out of embedded clauses are unproblematic, regardless of the 'thematic roles' involved.
(26) a. [Ken-ga kono-hon-o yonda] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.  
[Ken-sbj this-book-obj read] COMP Hanako-sbj think
b. kono-hon-wa [Ken-ga yonda] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
c. [[Ken-ga yonda] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] hon
the book which Hanako thinks that Ken read

[Ken-sbj every-morning this-park-theme take-a-walk] COMP Hanako-sbj think
Hanako thinks that Ken takes a walk every morning in this park.
c. [[Ken-ga mai-asa sampo-suru] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] koen
the park in which Hanako thinks that Ken takes a walk every morning

Extraction of ‘complements’ with postpositions other than *ga* or *o* is possible, although in some cases, topicalization and/or relativization are not allowed. This is due to the loss of the original postpositions, so the pattern almost exactly correspond to the cases of extraction from simple sentences. Thus, topicalization and relativization of *kara*-marked phrases out of embedded clauses are unproblematic, as is shown in (28).

(28) a. [Ken-wa kono-kaisya-kara syarei-o moratteiru] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.  
[Ken-sbj from-this-company fee-obj have-received] COMP Hanako-sbj think
Hanako thinks that Ken has received fee from this company.
b. kono-kaisya-wa [Ken-ga syarei-o moratteiru] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
b’. kono-kaisya-kara-wa [Ken-ga syarei-o moratteiru] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
c. [[Ken-ga syarei-o moratteiru] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] kaisya
the company from which Hanako thinks that Ken has received fee

Extraction of ‘possessive’ phrase is possible, although (29, b’) is either awkward or have other than intended meaning/reading.

(29) a. [Ken-ga sono-ronbun-no hihyo-o kaita] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.  
[Ken-sbj of-that-paper review-obj wrote] COMP Hanako-sbj think
Hanako thinks that Ken wrote a review of the paper.
b. sono-ronbun-wa [Ken-ga hihyo-o kaita] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
c. [[Ken-ga hihyo-o kaita] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] ronbun
the paper of which Hanako thinks that Ken wrote a review

A slightly more complicated case is where *de*-marked phrases for ‘reason’ or ‘rationale’ is involved. Sentence in (30, b) is almost completely incomprehensible and it is difficult to interpret the one in (30, c) in the intended sense, although this could be acceptable in the unintended interpretation shown in (31). In spite of this, it is rather difficult to say whether dislocation of *de*-marked phrases in itself is disallowed in Japanese, because sentences like (30, b’) or (30, c’) sound far better, at least to the present writer. It might simply be that the more straightforward interpretation as suggested in (31) exclude the intended interpretation of the sentences in question.
4.3 Dislocation from within Relative Clauses

A more interesting case can be found where dislocation from within relative clauses is involved. At first glance, extraction out of relative clauses seems disallowed in Japanese, just as in English. However, a closer investigation reveals that we cannot simply say that dislocation out of relative clauses itself makes the sentence in question unacceptable.

Let's take a look at the examples in (34) first. The example in (34, b) seems to suggest that dislocation from within a relative clause makes the sentence rather incomprehensible and ungrammatical. However, if we change the example into something like (34, d) thereby introducing some sense of quantification, the resulting sentence seems quite sensible and acceptable. Although we do not have a definitive explanation of why sentences in (34, b) is unacceptable, we have to admit
that dislocation from within a relative clause itself does not contribute too strongly in making the resulting sentence unacceptable.

Naomi-SBJ [this-book-SBJ read] man-OBJ met
Naomi met a man who read this book.
b. *[Naomi-ga yonda] otoko-ni atta] hon
the book which Naomi met a man who read
Naomi-SBJ [this-book-SBJ read] people-OBJ a-lot know
Naomi met a lot of people who read this book.
d. [Naomi-ga yonda] hito-o ozei sitteiru] hon
the book which Naomi knows a lot of people who read

It has sometimes been suggested that quantification might be an important factor in this respect. For instance, although (35, b) is not very bad, there is a distinctive difference in acceptability between this example in (35, b) on the one hand and the examples like (35, c) or (35, d) on the other. The latter cases involve some sense of quantification, which may be the reason for why these sound better.

Naomi-SBJ [that-director-sw directed] film-OBJ saw
Naomi saw films which that director took.
b. ?[Naomi-ga totta] eiga-o mita] kantoku
the director who Naomi saw films (he) took
c. [Naomi-ga totta] eiga-o zembu mita] kantoku
[Naomi-SBJ directed] films all saw] director
the director who Naomi saw all films which (he) took
d. [Naomi-ga totta] eiga-o mita-koto-ga-aru] kantoku
the director who Naomi have seen some films which (he) took

A similar distinction can be found when complements other than ‘subjects’ or ‘objects’ are involved in dislocation. Sentence in (36, d) is far better than that in (36, b). 10

Naomi-SBJ [this-company-SOURCE fee-OBJ received] man-OBJ met
Naomi met a man who received fee from this company.
b. *[Naomi-ga syarei-o moratta] otoko-ni atta] kaisya
the company which Naomi met a man who received fee from
Naomi-SBJ [this-company-SOURCE fee-OBJ received] people-OBJ a-lot know

45
Naomi knows a lot of people who received fee from this company.

d. [Naomi-ga [syarei-o moratta] hito-o ozei sitteiru] kaisya
the company which Naomi knows a lot of people who received fee from

In sum, although in some cases, extraction from within a relative clause results in a lower acceptability, sentences with almost the same construction are conceivable in which extraction from within a relative clause does not affect its acceptability. Thus, a reasonable conclusion that we can draw is that the restriction involved is more or less semantic in nature. We will have to conclude that in Japanese syntax, extraction from within a relative clause in itself is not prohibited.

5 Conclusion

We have seen various examples of Japanese sentences to verify if data regarding dislocation gives clues by which to distinguish ‘complements’ and ‘adjuncts’. However, what we found was idiosyncrasy of each sentence and word. Even extraction from within a relative clause is possible, although not all sentences with such constructions are acceptable in Japanese. Thus, as far as Japanese is concerned, it is rather difficult to find any definitive way to distinguish ‘complements’ and ‘adjuncts’.

This does not mean, of course, that the conventional distinction in syntactic study of English grammar is of no use in describing Japanese. However, we cannot take concepts and terminology established with respect to English and then apply them blindly to the study of Japanese. While grammatical concepts such as ‘phrase structure’, ‘complement’, ‘adjunct’ and so on should play a central role in the description of Japanese grammar, we have to be beware if the concepts established for English applies in the study of Japanese, or have to be reconstructed to be of as much use in describing Japanese grammar.

Notes

*This paper is based on an informal talk I gave at the symposium on the argument structure of Korean and Japanese in the sixth Korea-Japan Joint Linguistic Conference held in Sophia University on December 29th, 1989. My assignment at the symposium was to give a brief overview of how ‘argument structure’ is to be dealt with in terms of the grammatical formalisms of GPSG/HPSG/JPSG and then go on to discuss problems particular to Japanese. This paper is an attempt to reformulate the latter half of my discussion. Tutorial discussion that roughly corresponds to the former part of my talk will be published shortly (Harada: forthcoming). The data on Japanese dislocation phenomena is partly based on the result of the study conducted by JPSG-WG at ICOT. I would like to express my gratitude to each and every member of ICOT WG and to those who participated in the symposium. This study is partly supported by Waseda University Grant for Special Research Projects (89A-96).

1 As far as I can tell, ‘argumenthood’ is distinctively a ‘semantic’ notion, whereas ‘adjuncthood’ is more syntactic in nature.
Here again, Larson's terminology is somewhat disturbing. What he means by iterability, apparently, is possibility of recurrence of more than one phrase of the same type or function in a given sentence, rather than that of the same string.

However, in some dialect and/or idiolect at least, dislocation from within a subordinate clause is possible given reasonable context. Inoue (1976: pp. 184.) notes that there is a dialect in English in which (i, b) is allowed.

(i) a. You will cry when you see the movie.
   b. *That’s a movie that you will cry when you see.
   c. That’s a movie that you will cry when you see it.

Similarly, I cited the example in (ii) elsewhere (Harada: 1988).

(ii) These are the things I will be very unhappy if you break.

The story, of course, is not that simple, even for English. For instance, if you consider the case of noun phrases, the distinction that we discussed here is not that clear. Also, in the case of sentence modifiers, it is often claimed that iteration of the same sort of adjunct makes the sentence sound rather awkward.

Symbols such as 'SBJ' and 'OBJ' are given in the glosses for example Japanese sentences that follow in order to give the readers who do not speak the language some rough idea of the meaning of the sentences and words discussed. They are not intended to signify the exact 'thematic roles' of the phrases involved. Note in this connection that I assume that wa is used to mark subjects in ordinary matrix sentences without involving topicalization in some cases.

See Harada (1981) for some discussion of conjunction reduction and related constructions in English. Also, see Harada (1990) for some informal discussion of related constructions in Japanese.


Inoue (1976), considering a similar set of examples, gives basically the same observation, although the grammaticality judgment she gives to each sentence differs in various minor aspects from the one given here.

Preference between (37, b) and (37, b') may differ among speakers of Japanese and also depends heavily on context in which the utterance is made.

This sentence itself is acceptable in the following sense.

(i) The company in which Naomi met the man who had received fee.
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