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ABSTRACT

This thesis focuses on the use and functions of the complementizer という [to iu] as it pertains to Japanese clausal noun modification (CNM). という [To iu] appears between a modifying clause and its head noun. Depending on the circumstances, という [to iu]'s inclusion can be obligatory, optional, or even unacceptable. Following Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970), Bolinger (1972, 1977), and Tomura (1985), the present study hypothesizes that いう [to iu], a function word, can have semantic characteristics and that its presence/absence influences the meaning of the sentence. This study also follows Maynard (1992, 1993), who claims that the presence of いう [to iu] functions to make the information given in the modifying clause foregrounded by one or more of its following three characteristics: (1) new information, (2) dramatic effect, or (3) a direct quote. The main goal of this thesis is to identify and to explain the semantic difference between CNM where the addressee deliberately includes optional いう [to iu] and CNM where いう [to iu] is not included. Analysis of the context where the CNM occurs proves indispensable in order to identify which feature(s) permits optional いう [to iu] to be present.

Chapter One reviews previous studies which mainly investigate the structure within CNM. These researches analyze the distributional constraints according to the semantic characteristics of the head noun and the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause. Presenting a few examples of problematic CNM, however, clarifies that clausal/sentence level analysis cannot thoroughly predict いう [to iu]'s presence/absence in CNM. When classifying Japanese CNM, this thesis employs Matsumoto's (1988a, b) trichotomy based on a semantic and a pragmatic framework: CH-, NH-, and CNH-type CNM. Following Maynard, I hypothesize in Chapter Two that the presence of いう [to iu] is optional in all NH-type CNM and shows analysis of the context is indispensable. By analyzing written data, Chapter Three re-examines the following two conditions in NH-/CNH-type CNM: the conditions which require いう [to
illi obligatorily in NH-type CNM and the conditions which do not accept it in CNH-type CNM. Most examples where NH-/CNH-type CNM require という [to iu] obligatorily can be explained by Maynard's third distributional constraint, a direct quote. However, in the cases of CNM when the modality level of the modifying clause is two or below, という [to iu]'s absence in NH-type CNM cannot always be explained by clausal/sentence level analysis. This thesis will particularly concentrate on contextual analysis of level one NH-type CNM. In Chapter Four, I will point out NH-type CNM which were formerly considered exceptions to the general rule can be explained by one or more of the three features proposed by Maynard. Chapter Five, the Conclusion, summarizes the issues investigated in this thesis and raises possible topics for further study.
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>past tense form</td>
</tr>
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<td>QUE</td>
<td>question particle</td>
</tr>
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<td>QUO</td>
<td>quotative marker</td>
</tr>
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<td>SF</td>
<td>sentence final particle</td>
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Introduction

This thesis analyzes the Japanese complementizer という [to iu] as it functions in clausal noun modification (CNM). Morphologically, という [to iu] consists of the verb 言う [iu] ('to speak' or 'to say') and the quotative particle と [to]. Sometimes its use is obligatory; sometimes it is optional, and sometimes it is unacceptable to include という [to iu] in Japanese clausal noun modification. Although Teramura (1977b), Song (1979, 1982), Terakura (1980, 1984), Tomura (1985, 1990, 1991), Matsumoto (1988a, b, 1996a, b), Kim, (1989), Tokuda (1989), Oshima (1991), and Watanabe (1996) have examined the use and functions of という [to iu] in Japanese CNM, predicting its distributional constraints in CNM proves difficult, particularly for という [to iu]'s optional use. This thesis proposes that knowing the context, or situational information, is crucial in understanding the use and functions as well as the distributional constraints of という [to iu]. Further, examining the context where CNM is used clarifies how the presence/absence of optional という [to iu] influences the way statements are interpreted.

When Japanese CNM includes いう [to iu], two possible uses emerge: one use retains its basic quality as a quotation marker while the other functions as a complementizer. Compare the following examples:

1Tomura (1985, 1990) classifies いう [to iu] as a complementizer, which is generally accepted in Japanese linguistics. For a detailed examination of syntactic treatments of いう [to iu], see Nakau (1973), Josephs (1976) and Tomura (1985). Chapter One, Background of the Study, defines Japanese CNM. There are two ways of writing いう [to iu] in romanization: "to iu" and "to yuu." Teramura (1972), Martin (1975), and Matsumoto (1988a, b) use "to iu," while "to yuu" is used by Terakura (1980, 1984), Maynard (1992, 1993), Matsumoto (1996a, b) and others. This study uses いう [to iu] in order to be consistent.
I read the book which Mr. Mori says is very interesting.

I learned the fact that Mr. Mori went to Ottawa.

In example (1), という[to iu] maintains its basic quality as a quotation marker. Its approximate English translation means "that (person) say(s)." Hence, という[to iu] in example (1) indicates an indirect quote. In example (2), however, という[to iu] corresponds to the English complementizer "that." This study is concerned only with the latter example, or という[to iu] used as a complementizer, and excludes quotative という[to iu] as illustrated in example (1).

A review of basic Japanese grammar and CNM will help to clarify という[to iu]'s overall role as it relates to CNM. Typologically, Japanese is classified as an SOV (Subject + Object + Verb) language. According to Greenberg (1966), Japanese is strictly a verb-final language. The word order within a clause, however, remains relatively free because of the presence of particles, or case markers. Therefore, in order to interpret the exact meaning of a clause or phrase, one must consider what kind of particle a noun takes within the clause. Even when Japanese native speakers sometimes delete some nouns along with the particles that follow them, their listeners can reconstruct them according to the context. Furthermore, the

2When という[to iu] retains its original meaning, it may be written と言う or という. On the other hand, という[to iu] is used as a complementizer, it is seldom written と言う. There is room for further investigation what ratio と言う[to iu] bears to という[to iu] in written works when used as a complementizer as well as a combination of the quotative particle and the verb 'to speak.'

3For more information regarding the Japanese language and its grammar, see Kuno (1973) and Shibatani (1990). As a further source, Martin (1975) contains a detailed description of Japanese grammar.
deletion of understood elements occurs not only in matrix clauses but also in CNM modifying clauses. Because of this phenomenon, the present study assumes that analysis of the function of という [to iu] must address and consider the context or information regarding the situation. Another significant characteristic of the Japanese language concerns the fixed word order between the noun modified and the modifying word(s), phrase or clause: the modifying constituent always precedes the noun modified. As shown in examples (1) and (2), Japanese CNM also observes this rule; modifying clauses always precede their head nouns.

Before analyzing how the complementizer という [to iu] functions in Japanese CNM, a brief review of former studies will provide background information necessary to illuminate how CNM functions within the Japanese language. Muraki (1970), Okutsu (1974) and Inoue (1976) categorize Japanese CNM into two types: relative-clause types such as example (1) and appositive-clause types such as example (2). These linguists derive their classification from the syntactic differences between the two types of CNM, and follow a linguistic framework developed by Indo-European languages such as generative grammar. Teramura (1975, 1977a, 1977b and 1978) also divides CNM into two categories: inner-relationship and outer-relationship. Example (1) corresponds to inner-relationship CNM while example (2) demonstrates outer-relationship CNM. His analysis examines both the semantic and the syntactic relationship between the head noun and its modifying clause. Matsumoto (1988a, b), however, claims that these analyses do not take into account the underlying and significant differences between Japanese and Indo-European languages such as English, German, and French. In order to comprehend Japanese CNM, Matsumoto introduces a semantic and pragmatic framework. She categorizes Japanese CNM into three sub-types: Clause Host (CH) type, Noun Host (NH) type, and Appositive Host (AH) type.

Okutsu (1974) calls the former 同一名詞連体修飾 [doitsu meishi rentai shūshoku] ('same noun modification') and the latter 付加名詞連体修飾 [fuka meishi rentai shūshoku] ('appositive noun modification'). Inoue (1976) names the former a 'relative clause' and the latter an 'appositive clause.' The terms used by other researchers will be introduced in detail in Section 1.1.
type, and Clause and Noun Host (CNH) type. In order to understand all three constructions properly, she proposes that the addressee must share cultural and social knowledge with the addressee. She calls this shared knowledge "world-view." Chapter One discusses Teramura's and Matsumoto's frameworks in detail.

The researchers who examine Japanese CNM also discuss the use and functions of the complementizer といる [to iu]. By adapting structuralist theories in the broad sense, Muraki (1970), Okutsu (1974) and Inoue (1976) define といる [to iu] as a complementizer which functions similarly to the English complementizer "that." Teramura (1977b) and Matsumoto (1988a, b, 1996a, b), however, point out that といる [to iu] in Japanese CNM is not equivalent to the English complementizer "that." Teramura (1977b) indicates that the complementizer といる [to iu] in Japanese CNM cannot always be translated into the English complementizer "that." In addition, when subclassifying one of his dichotomies, outer-relationship CNM, he examines the influence which specific head nouns have regarding whether or not the speaker includes といる [to iu] in the statement. On the other hand, Matsumoto (1988a, b) bases her CNM classification system on the relationship between the head noun and its modifying clause. Although she does not focus on it, the presence/absence of といる [to iu] still influences her classification.

Researchers who study how noun complementations function in general also examine the use and functions of the complementizer といる [to iu]. When Josephs (1976) analyzes the Japanese nominalizers の [no] and こと [koto], he claims that といる [to iu] has an "inherent

Matsumoto's CH-type CNM corresponds to Teramura's inner-relationship. However, she divides Teramura's outer-relationship into NH-type and CNH-type according to the relationship between the head noun and its modifying clause.

Linguists such as Hasegawa (1981), Saito (1985), Kuroda (1986), and Hagiwara (1994) hypothesize that Japanese "relativization" can be explained by a movement rule within the framework of the Government and Binding theory.
meaning" which designates "non-factiveness." Terakura (1980) examines という [to iu] which exists before the nominalizers の [no] and こと [koto] and concludes that という [to iu] represents "a proposition." Terakura (1984) specifically investigates the relationship between という [to iu] and CNM head nouns in the case of both nominalizers and lexical nouns. She divides the use of という [to iu] into three categories: obligatory, optional, and unacceptable という [to iu]. She concludes that determining the presence/absence of という [to iu] from syntactic evidence alone proves difficult because the speaker's attitude, knowledge and judgement influence the (non-)occurrence of という [to iu]. She proposes that the addressee indicates by including or excluding という [to iu] whether or not a certain situation is depicted as a proposition.

Following Terakura's (1984) (non-)use of という [to iu], this thesis proposes that knowing the context in which the CNM appears is indispensable in understanding the use and functions of という [to iu], especially in optional situations. In order to clarify the conditions governing という [to iu]'s optional use, Chapter One reviews former studies of the relationship between Japanese CNM and the complementizer という [to iu]. Chapter Two introduces the terms and framework of this thesis. Both Chapter Three and Chapter Four examine the use and functions of the complementizer という [to iu] in Japanese CNM by analyzing examples found in novels and essays. Using the data from novels and essays helps to demonstrate which situations require or do not require という [to iu]. Chapter Three focuses on the constraints of obligatory and unacceptable という [to iu]. Chapter Four examines the conditions where optional という [to iu] is or is not included. It analyzes the context where CNM is included. It also discusses how the presence/absence of optional という [to iu] functions to influence the meaning of the

7Makino and Tsutsui (1986) define a nominalizer as a category which turns not "just a verb or adjective but an entire sentence into a noun phrase" (195).

8Terakura (1980, 1984) defines propositions as "conceptual entities like facts." She states that propositions show subjectivity while facts include objectivity. Other researchers define a proposition in terms of its antonym, "modality." The "proposition" is defined as that part of the sentence which conveys the objective fact and/or state of mind. Section 1.2.2 introduces the definition of proposition by other researchers. Note that Terakura's definition of "propositions" is different from other researchers.
sentence. The following demonstrate examples of each type of という [to iu]:

(3) obligatory という [to iu]:

[[森さんが試験を受けるだろう]] 話
[[mori-san ga shiken o ukeru darō]] という

[Mr. Mori NOM exam ACC take probably will] いう story

the story that Mr. Mori will probably take the exam

(4) optional という [to iu]:

[[森さんが試験を受かった]] 話
[[mori-san ga shiken o uketa]] いう

[Mr. Mori NOM exam ACC took] いう story

the story that Mr. Mori took the exam

(5) unacceptable という [to iu]:

森さんは試験を受かった]] 話
[[mori-san wa shiken o uketa]] 話

Mr. Mori TOP exam ACC took] いう

As a result of [having taken] the exam, Mr. Mori went to America.

Even though examples (3) and (4) employ the same head noun 話 [hanashi] ('story'), example (3) requires という [to iu] obligatorily while example (4) takes いう [to iu] optionally. CNM in example (5), on the other hand, would be grammatically unacceptable if いう [to iu] were to be included. Chapter Three examines why CNM like example (3) requires いう [to iu] obligatorily and why CNM such as example (5) must not include いう [to iu]. CNM exemplified in example (4), however, may or may not take いう [to iu]. Chapter Four investigates what constraints influence the presence/absence of いう [to iu] in an optional situation. It also discusses the semantic differences that exist between CNM with and without optional いう [to iu].
Tomura (1985, 1990) defines the complementizer という [to iu] in Japanese CNM as a function word. According to Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970), and Bolinger (1972, 1977), function words can have semantic properties and their presence/absence can change the meaning of a sentence. Researchers such as Tomura (1985, 1991), Kim (1989), Tokuda (1989), and Oshima (1991) also follow their hypotheses. They investigate the semantic differences between CNM where いう [to iu] is used and not used in an optional situation. They all agree that the presence/absence of optional いう [to iu] can reveal the speaker's attitude, opinion, and/or reaction towards the content of the modifying clause. Their comparisons between CNM with and without いう [to iu], however, do not clearly explain the conditions governing いう [to iu]'s optional use and functions. I believe that this lack of clarity results from the fact that their studies mainly employ hypothetical examples of CNM. Furthermore, even when they do use actual data, the semantic differences they claim are not persuasive because their data do not include the surrounding context. This further supports my proposal that the optional use of いう [to iu] must be analyzed in context.

Maynard (1992, 1993) examines Japanese CNM in discourse and analyzes the use and functions of optional いう [to iu]. She hypothesizes that いう [to iu] can be employed as a Discourse Modality Indicator. Maynard (1993) also claims that the complementizer いう [to iu] "connects two modes of interaction, 'saying' and 'describing'" (252). She speculates that the speaker focuses attention on the modifying clause by including いう [to iu] in an optional situation. Conversely, a speaker who excludes いう [to iu] in an optional situation focuses attention on the head noun. In other words, optional いう [to iu] appears in Japanese CNM

---

9Trask (1993) defines a function word as a "word with little or no intrinsic semantic content which primarily serves some grammatical purpose" such as of and the (123).

10Section 1.3.2 discusses their analyses.

11Section 1.3.3 defines "Discourse Modality" and "Discourse Modality Indicator."
when information contained in the modifying clause is foregrounded. The information is foregrounded because it is new or unexpected, or because its content is relatively important in the discourse. The speaker uses という [to iu] in order to add more dramatic emphasis as well. By analyzing CNM within the context of novels and essays, Maynard clarifies the function of optional という [to iu].

It should be noted that my data are mostly taken from Japanese novels and essays. Except for the data cited in the work of other researchers, all were selected from contemporary works written in the 1980s and 1990s. The target audience of all the works is the adult reader. The number of writers is sixteen: eight are male, seven are female, and one is anonymous. I chose to use written data only in order to avoid っていう [tte iu], the colloquial form of という [to iu], which overwhelmingly dominates spoken data. This thesis does not investigate variants of という [to iu] such as っていう [tte iu], いった [to itta], and って [tte]. I assume that there is a semantic difference between という [to iu] and its variants.

---

12 Hopper and Thompson (1980) mention that foregrounded information supplies "main points of discourse" while backgrounded information "assists, amplifies, comments on the part of discourse" (280). For example, in the sentence "When I went to school, I met John," "when I went to school" is backgrounded information whereas "I met John" shows foregrounded information.

13 On the difference between という [to iu] and いった [to itta], see Fujita (1987).
Chapter One

Background of This Thesis

1.0 Introduction

This chapter reviews previous studies of Japanese CNM and considers other background information necessary to help in the understanding of the different use and functions that いう [to iu] shows in Japanese CNM. Section 1.1 examines the basic characteristics of Japanese CNM. Section 1.1.1 presents Teramura's (1975, 1977a, 1977b, 1978) classification of Japanese CNM, and Section 1.1.2 introduces an alternative framework proposed by Matsumoto (1988a, b). Section 1.1.3 discusses the intrinsic characteristics of Japanese CNM which are often neglected under the language framework based on Indo-European languages such as English, German, French and so on. Section 1.2 focuses on the general relationship between CNM and いう [to iu]. Section 1.2.1 introduces the use of いう [to iu] in the Japanese language. Section 1.2.2 discusses the relationship between the complementizer いう [to iu] and the modality of the modifying clause in CNM. Sections 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 review Teramura's (1977b) and Matsumoto's (1988a, b) analyses of the relationship between the complementizer いう [to iu] and Japanese CNM. Section 1.3 proposes that いう [to iu] which functions as a complementizer has semantic meaning. Section 1.3.1 introduces theories which claim function words do influence the meaning of the sentence. Section 1.3.2 reviews previous studies on the use(s) and functions of optional いう [to iu]. Section 1.3.3 introduces Maynard (1992, 1993) and shows that examining the context in which CNM appears is indispensable in order to provide a clear understanding of the use(s) and functions of optional いう [to iu] in Japanese CNM.

1.1 Japanese CNM

Based on the English categorization of noun-modifying construction, Japanese CNM is usually classified into two subtypes: relative-like and appositive-like clauses. However,
researchers use different terms. The following table demonstrates examples of various researchers' terms:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>relative-like clause</th>
<th>appositive-like clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okutsu (1974)</td>
<td>[dōitsu meishi rentai shūshoku]</td>
<td>[fuka meishi rentai shūshoku]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>('same noun modification')</td>
<td>('appositive noun modification')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (1975)</td>
<td>extruded epithemes</td>
<td>intruded epithemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoue (1976)</td>
<td>relative clause</td>
<td>appositive clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teramura</td>
<td>[uchi no kankei]</td>
<td>[soto no kankei]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard (1992, 1993)</td>
<td>relative like construction</td>
<td>explanatory construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study hereafter employs Teramura's terms inner-relationship and outer-relationship when referring to these two classifications. Teramura's (1977) classification differs from Okutsu (1974), Martin (1975), and Inoue (1976). He considers the semantic as well as the syntactic relationship between the head noun and its modifying clause. Inner-relationship is classified according to the syntactic relationship between the head noun and its modifying clause, while outer-relationship is interpreted according to the semantic relationship between them.

Refuting Teramura's two different perspectives in classifying Japanese CNM, Matsumoto (1988a, b) introduces the concept of frame semantics (Fillmore 1978). She proposes that if we expect to comprehend Japanese CNM, it is essential to rely on both a semantic and a pragmatic understanding of the head noun and its modifying clause. In so doing, she classifies semantic relationships between the modifying clause and its head noun into three categories: Clause Host (CH), Noun Host (NH), and Clause and Noun Host (CNH) types. In order to construe these three constructions properly, she claims that the interlocutor must hold a shared

---

1While accepting Teramura's dichotomy, Maynard (1992, 1993) yet uses the different terms as shown in Table 1.
1.1.1 Teramura's Framework: Inner- and Outer-Relationship

Teramura (1975, 1977a, 1977b, 1978) classifies Japanese CNM into two categories: one is 内の関係 [uchi no kankei] ('inner-relationship'); the other is 外の関係 [soto no kankei] ('outer-relationship'). The following is an example of inner-relationship CNM:

(1) 私は [学生が 昨日 買った] 本を 読んだ。
    watashi wa [gakusei ga kinō katta] hon o yonda.
    I read the book which the student[s] bought yesterday.

Inner-relationship Japanese CNM has the same syntactic structure as the English relative clause. There are, however, two remarkable differences between Japanese and English. First, in Japanese a head noun always follows its modifying clause while in English it always precedes its relative clause. Second, in English a relative pronoun is present between the head noun and its relative clause. Relative pronouns such as 'who,' 'which,' and 'whom' serve as overt markers of the relative position of the head noun to its modifying clause. The Japanese language does not have any relative pronoun either semantically or morphologically. In spite of these syntactic differences, there is an apparent similarity between the two languages. In both English and Japanese, any noun can be the head noun of the CNM. More importantly, a case relationship exists between the head noun [hon] ('book') and its modifying clause 学生が 昨日買った [gakusei ga kinō katta] ('which the student[s] bought yesterday'). The following sentence demonstrates this relationship:

(1)' 学生が 昨日 本を 買った。
    gakusei ga kinō hon o katta.
    The student[s] bought a book yesterday.

The modifying clause can be reconstructed to form an independent sentence that incorporates

2As mentioned in Introduction, one difference between inner-relationship CNM and outer-relationship CNM is that という [to iu] as a complementizer cannot be present in inner-relationship CNM. Therefore, there is no という [to iu] in example (1).
the head noun. Example (1)' shows that in both English and Japanese well-formed sentences can be made by combining the head noun with its modifying clause. In Japanese as well as in English, the head noun 本人 [hon] ('book') is the grammatical object of the verb 読んで [yonda] ('read [past]') in the main clause of example (1). The head noun 本人 [hon] ('book') in example (1) can also be construed as an object of the verb 買った [katta] ('bought [PAST]') in the modifying clause. Therefore, the head noun modified by the modifying clause has a case relationship with the verb in its modifying clause. This characteristic of inner-relationship CNM serves to distinguish it from outer-relationship CNM.

Teramura (1977b) classifies CNM other than those of inner-relationship as outer-relationship. He derives this term from his findings that the head noun is positioned outside, or out of the modifying clause. The following shows an example of outer-relationship CNM:

(2) 私 は [森さん が オタワ へ 行った] 話 を 聞いた。
    watashi wa [mori-san ga otawa e itta] hanashi o kiiita.
    I TOP [Mr. Mori NOM Ottawa LOC went] story ACC heard.
    I heard the story that Mr. Mori went to Ottawa.

Example (2) shows the crucial difference between inner-relationship CNM and outer-relationship CNM: the head noun in example (1) can have a case relationship with its subordinate clause, but that of example (2) can be inserted into the embedded clause neither in English nor in Japanese. As shown in example (2)', the head noun cannot have a case relationship with its modifying clause.

(2)' *森さん が オタワ へ 話 に へ ...行った。
    *mori-san ga otawa e hanashi ni e ...itta.
    *Mr. Mori NOM Ottawa LOC story ACC NOM/DAT LOC ... went.

Example (2)' is ill-formed no matter what particle may follow the noun 話 [hanashi] ('story'). Head nouns in outer-relationship CNM do not have a case relationship with the verb in their modifying clause. The modifying clause in example (2) 森さんがオタワへ行った [mori-san ga otawa e itta] ('Mr. Mori went to Ottawa') describes what kind of 話 [hanashi] ('story') it is.
Accordingly, the modifying clause complements the meaning designated by the head noun. Hence, Okutsu (1974) and Inoue (1976) claim that outer-relationship Japanese CNM is comparable to an English appositive clause. Another reason why they consider outer-relationship CNM to be similar to an appositive clause is because outer-relationship CNM requires the complementizer という [to iu] just as an English appositive clause requires a complementizer such as "that." However, not all outer-relationship CNM cannot be translated into an English appositive clause.

Teramura (1977b) also asserts the necessity of considering the semantic relationship between the head noun and its modifying clause in outer-relationship Japanese CNM. He examines this relationship and subclassifies outer-relationship CNM into two subtypes: 内容補充の連体修飾 [naiyō hojū no rentai shūshoku] ('content-complement outer relationship CNM') and 相対補充の連体修飾 [soitai hojū no rentai shūshoku] ('relational-complement outer-relationship CNM'). In content-complement outer-relationship CNM, the modifying clause complements the content of its head noun. On the other hand, in relational-complement outer-relationship CNM, the modifying clause expresses the content of the antonym of the head noun. This issue will be discussed in detail in Section 1.2.3 along with the presence/absence of the complementizer という [to iu]. Figure 1 represents Teramura's framework:

---

3 Masuoka (1994) states that the main element of outer-relationship CNM is not the head noun but the modifying clause. He claims that the head noun just supplements the information on what kind of category the modifying clause belongs to. This study, however, follows Teramura's inner-/outer-relationship dichotomy because it is necessary to compare Teramura's theory with Matsumoto's (1988) in order to analyze the function of the complementizer という [to iu].

4 Section 1.2 discusses the relationship between the complementizer という [to iu] and outer-relationship CNM.
The next section introduces Matsumoto's (1988) analysis which asserts the importance of a pragmatic analysis of Japanese CNM.

1.1.2 Matsumoto's Framework: Three Types of CNM

Teramura's dichotomy (inner- and outer-relationship CNM) leaves some issues unresolved although it is widely accepted among the linguists in Japan. Observe the following example:

(3) [head NOM good-become] book
The book [by reading] which [one's] head becomes good
(= If a person reads the book, he/she will become brighter.) (Teramura 1977a: 7)

Teramura defines example (3) as CNM which does not follow the general principles of inner-relationship Japanese CNM. He calls this type of inner-relationship CNM 短絡 [танраку] ('truncate'), because no direct syntactic relationship exists between the head noun 本 [hon] ('book') and its modifying clause 頭がよくなる [atama ga yokunaru] ('[one's] head becomes good'). Though he does not fully analyze this type of exception, Teramura (1977b) mentions that this kind of CNM is "formed by the deletion of not only a case marker but also by other linguistic elements when a noun in a sentence 'moves out' to be a head noun" and further analysis is in order (34-35). He also claims that a semantic and pragmatic analysis is essential.
to interpret some Japanese CNM such as example (3).

Matsumoto (1988a, b) points out a discrepancy in Teramura's framework. He construes inner-relationship syntactically but interprets outer-relationship semantically. She claims that a semantic and pragmatic understanding of the relationship between a head noun and its modifying clause is essential in comprehending Japanese CNM. In order to accomplish this goal, Matsumoto employs the concept of frame semantics (Fillmore 1978) in creating her trichotomy of Japanese CNM. She classifies the semantic relationships between the modifying clause and its head noun into three types: Clause Host (CH), Noun Host (NH), and Clause and Noun Host (CNH) types. Table 2 below is adapted from Collier-Sanuki (1993):
Table 2

Types of Japanese CNM by Matsumoto

[= summary of Matsumoto (1988a, b)]

I. **Clause Host (CH) type**: Constructions in which the modifying clause hosts the head noun; i.e., constructions in which a member of the category denoted by the head noun participates in a frame evoked by the main predicate of the modifying clause.

[食べ] 店
[tabeta] mise
[ate] shop
the shop [at which] [e₁] ate [e₂]

The possible relationships between the modifying clauses and head nouns include (a) condition and consequence, (b) purpose and requisite, (c) simultaneous actions, events and states, (d) actions or events in simple temporal sequence, (e) topic and comment, and (f) part and whole.

II. **Noun Host (NH) type**: Constructions in which the head noun hosts the modifying clause.

[食べ] 話
[tabeta] hanashi
[ate] story
the story [that] [e₁] ate [e₂]

The types of head nouns that qualify for this type include (a) speech act nouns, (b) nouns of thoughts and feelings, and (c) proposition-taking nouns.

III. **Clause and Noun Host (CNH) type**: Constructions in which both the modifying clause and the head noun host reciprocally; i.e., in which the head noun can evoke a frame containing a slot for what is expressed by the modifying clause, while the frame evoked by the modifying clause in turn contains a possible participant role to be filled by the denotation of the head noun.

[食べ] 帰り
[tabeta] kaeri
[ate] return
the way back [from] eating

The types of head nouns qualify for this type include (a) relational nouns, (b) quasi-relational nouns, and (c) nouns of perception.

(Matlier-Sanuki 1993: 16-17)

Matsumoto mentions that most CH-type CNM have the same characteristics of Teramura's inner-relationship CNM. In CH-type CNM, the modifying clause has a case relationship with its head noun. This construal is a straightforward interpretation. CH-type CNM also includes
cases of 短絡 [tanraku] ('truncate') such as example (3). Matsumoto (1988b) states that the head noun in 短絡 [tanraku] ('truncate') "cannot be linked to an argument or even, in the usual sense, an adjunct of the predicate of the modifying clause" (7). She also claims that the "construer's social/cultural knowledge about a situation [knowledge which the addressee depends on] can sometimes provide" a plausible interpretation for 短絡 [tanraku] ('truncate') (74). Hence, shared knowledge of a situation remains a necessary element in comprehending Japanese CNM in general.

Matsumoto's NH-/CNH-type CNM generally correspond to Teramura's outer-relationship. In NH-type CNM the modifying clause typically complements the content of the head noun by designating a speech act, a fact, or an event. The head noun functions to summarize what is expressed by its modifying clause. CNH-type CNM is what Teramura classifies as a subtype of outer-relationship, relational-complement outer-relationship. In this construction, both the head noun and its modifying clause host each other reciprocally. The addressee depends on the "world-view" in order to precisely interpret the CNM. Figure 2 represents Matsumoto's framework:

Figure 2

Matsumoto's Framework of Japanese CNM

![Diagram of Matsumoto's Framework of Japanese CNM]

Matsumoto's (1988a, b) classification differs from Teramura's (1975, 1977a, b, 1978) in that she demonstrates CNM which cannot be adequately explained without using her semantic
framework. I will discuss this further in Chapter Two, but I will now examine a few issues concerning problematic Japanese CNM, which Matsumoto reveals in her study.

1.1.3 The Problems of Classifying Japanese CNM

In Japanese, elements of a sentence such as subjects and objects may be freely omitted when they are expected to be understood by the addressee. In addition, since Japanese is a verb-final language, post-positional particles, or case markers following nouns, are omitted together with nouns when their corresponding nouns are omitted. Therefore, unlike in English, the cases and functions of head nouns in Japanese are not clearly marked at the surface level.

Examine the following examples from Matsumoto (1988b):

(4) \[
[\text{book ACC bought}] \text{ student[s]}
\]
(4a) the student[s] who bought the book
(4b) the student[s] for whom [e] bought a book
(4c) the student[s] [from whom] [e] bought a book

Example (4) points out that the possible absence of certain words in the example can lead to many possible interpretations such as examples (4a, b, c). As Matsumoto (1988b) explains, "in Japanese, unlike in English, the connection is not determined by the structure, but, rather, relies on a semantic and pragmatic understanding of the noun and clause" (7). She concludes that interpretation of Japanese CNM depends a good deal on understanding the context in which the statement occurs. The traditional way of discussing CNM construction is in comparison to English relative and appositive clauses. These comparisons, however, do not adequately explain the construction of Japanese CNM. The most common interpretation of example (4) is (4a), "the student who bought the book." However, the construal in (4c) is most appropriate in the

5Matsumoto (1988a, b), however, does not analyze CNM in context. This distinguishes her analysis from those of Maynard (1992, 1993). Section 1.3.3 discusses Maynard's framework in detail.

6What Matsumoto (1988a, b) claims here is that Japanese CNM is "discourse-based" while English relative or appositive clauses are "structurally-based." Déchaine (personal communication) comments that the phenomenon allowing such ambiguous interpretations is not a characteristic which differentiates Japanese from English. She points out that English examples such as "flying planes can be dangerous," and "I saw the man on the roof" are structurally ambiguous, too.
As demonstrated above, a Japanese CNM can have multiple interpretations depending on the context. Therefore, the addressee of the Japanese language must depend on the shared knowledge, or "world-view" to construe the interpretation intended by the addressor. An English relative clause, on the other hand, allows for only one construal because the syntactic and semantic relationship between the head noun and its modifying clause is clear from the syntactic structure.

Example (5) shows inner-relationship or CH-type CNM. This example of Japanese CNM is complicated and requires an analysis based on the context:

(5) [夜 トイレ に 行けなくなる] 話
    [night bathroom LOC go-cannot-become] story

(5a) CH-type interpretation
    the story [because of hearing] which [one] becomes unable to go to the bathroom at night

(5b) NH-type interpretation
    the story that [somebody] becomes unable to go to the bathroom at night

Matsumoto notes that example (5) is ambiguous because it conveys two possible messages. She comments that example (5) can be interpreted as CH-type CNM when its meaning is example (5a). This CH-type CNM is called 短絡 [tanraku] ("truncate") and requires a shared "world-view" between the addressor and the addressee in order to be comprehended properly. She explains that Japanese native speakers share a general knowledge that bathrooms in Japan were traditionally isolated and very dark at night. This made people "not want to go there alone after hearing a scary story" (Matsumoto 1988b: 93). She also points out that example (5) is classified as NH-type CNM if it is construed as in example (5b). In NH-type CNM, there is
no case relationship between the modifying clause and its head noun. In these situations, the
modifying clause complements the content of the head noun. Only the context will determine
which interpretation is appropriate. The addressee must determine the meaning of a statement
by considering the context in which it appears. Chapter Four analyzes the CNM such as
example (5) in detail and shows how the presence/absence of という [to iu] influences its
meaning. The following sections will review the relationship between the complementizer という [to iu] and Teramura's and Matsumoto's framework respectively.

1.2 という [To iu] and Japanese CNM

This section reviews the distribution of the complementizer という [to iu] in Japanese
CNM. It also shows how the complementizer という [to iu]'s presence/absence plays a significant
role in classifying Japanese CNM. Section 1.2.1 introduces the various ways という [to iu] is
used in the Japanese language. Section 1.2.2 discusses the relationship between という [to iu]
and the modality of the modifying clause in CNM. Sections 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 discuss the
relationship between the complementizer という [to iu] and outer-relationship and NH/CNH-type
CNM respectively.

1.2.1 Basic Use of という [to iu] in the Japanese Language

As mentioned in the Introduction, morphologically という [to iu] is a combination of
the verb 言う [iu] ('to speak' or 'to say') preceded by the quotative particle と [to]. と [To]
mirrors either the English complementizer "that" or quotation markers. The following
examples show this basic use of という [to iu]:

---

7 In example (5), という [to iu] can be present between the modifying clause and its head noun when it is
NH-type CNM. The presence of いう [to iu] is optional in this CNM. If いう [to iu] is inserted, however, the
CNM can only be interpreted as "the story that [somebody] becomes unable to go to the bathroom at night."

8 English quotation markers (" "') correspond to 「 」 in Japanese language.
(6a) Indirect Quote:

森さん は この 本 は おもしろい と 言う。
mori-san wa kono hon wa omoshiroi to iu.
Mr. Mori says that this book is interesting.

(6b) Direct Quote:

森さん は 「この 本 は おもしろい」と 言う。
mori-san wa "kono hon wa omoshiroi" to iu.
Mr. Mori says, "This book is interesting."

When followed by a verb of speech and/or thought, the particle と [to] can indicate either direct or indirect quotation. This basic use of という [to iu] almost always appears at the end of a clause. However, という [to iu] can also be used to connect two nouns as shown in the following examples:

(7a) Noun, という [to iu] Noun,

森さん とい う 人
mori-san to iu hito
Mr. Mori called person
the person called Mr. Mori

(7b) Noun, という [to iu] Noun,

花 とい う 花
hana to iu hana
flower called flower
all the flowers

In example (7a), という [to iu] connects two different nouns. As shown in example (7a), the phrase means "Noun, called (or named) Noun,." Therefore, Noun, is usually a proper noun such as the name of a person, a city, a country and so on. Noun, describes the category in which Noun, belongs. In example (7b), という [to iu] connects two identical nouns, and the phrase means "all the Noun." This usage is not common in speech and sounds archaic. Since this thesis deals with the use and functions of optional という [to iu] in Japanese CNM, I will

9For more characteristics of Japanese quotation, see Kuno (1988).

not examine noun-combining という [to iu] as illustrated in examples (7a) and (7b).

In order to introduce the basic use of という [to iu] which functions to connect a noun with its modifying clause, I repeat below examples (3), (4), and (5) from the Introduction as examples (8a), (8b), and (8c) for the sake of convenience:

(8a) obligatory という [to iu]:
[[森さん が 試験 を 受ける だろう] { * ∅ } ] 話
[[mori-san ga shiken o ukeru darō] { * ∅ } ] hanashi
[Mr. Mori NOM exam ACC take probably will] *[∅ ] ] story
the story that Mr. Mori will probably take the test

(8b) optional という [to iu]:
[[森さん が 試験 を 受けた] { ∅ } ] 話
[[mori-san ga shiken o uketa] { ∅ } ] hanashi
[Mr. Mori NOM exam ACC took] { ∅ } story
the story that Mr. Mori took the exam

(8c) unacceptable という [to iu]:
森さん は 試験 を 受けた [ * という ] 結果、 アメリカ へ 行った。
mori-san wa [shiken o uketa] [ * という ] kekka, amerika e itta
Mr. Mori TOP [exam ACC took] [ *COMP] result, America LOC went
As a result of [having taken] the exam, Mr. Mori went to America.

Examples (8a), (8b) and (8c) show という [to iu] connecting nouns with their modifying clauses. All of the examples above are classified as outer-relationship or NH/CNH-type Japanese CNM. という [To iu] can also exist in inner-relationship/CH-type construction. The syntactic function of という [to iu], however, shows the difference in the meaning of という [to iu] between them. In inner-relationship/CH-type CNM, if the speaker includes という [to iu] in the statement, the original meaning of the verb 言う [iu] ('to speak' or 'to say') is preserved. と
いう [To iu] in outer-relationship or NH-type CNM functions much like the English complementizer "that." The following examples show the distinction between inner-relationship/CH-type CNM and outer-relationship/NH-type CNM. Here I repeat examples (1) and (2) from the Introduction for convenience:

(9) inner-relationship or CH-type CNM

watashi wa [mori-san ga [tometo omoshiroi] to iu] hon o yonda.
I TOP [Mr. Mori NOM[very interesting] QUO speak] book ACC

I read the book which Mr. Mori says is very interesting.

(10) outer-relationship or NH-type CNM

watashi wa [[mori-san ga Ottawa e itta] to iu] jijitsu o shitteita.
I TOP [[Mr. Mori NOM Ottawa LOC went] COMP] fact ACC

I learned the fact that Mr. Mori went to Ottawa.

という [To iu] in example (9) is interpreted as a combination of a quotation case marker と [to] and a verb 言う [iu], which means "to speak" or "to say." Hence, という [To iu] in example (9) means "that [someone] say(s)" in English. The quotation marker と [to] basically functions to connect the embedded clause, which shows the utterances that people make, with its matrix clause. Therefore, the particle と [to] is interpreted as indicating direct quotation markers or as being similar to the complementizer "that." In English the complementizer "that" joins the verb of the matrix clause to its subordinate clause. Accordingly, the way という [To iu] is used in Japanese CNM becomes the key to classifying Japanese CNM. という [To iu] in inner-relationship or CH-type construction functions to denote hearsay. という [To iu] in example (10), however, shows という [To iu] used as a complementizer. It connects the head noun with
This study is concerned only with という [to iu] which is used as a complementizer and it excludes an analysis of という [to iu] as it pertains to Teramura's inner-relationship or Matsumoto's CH-type CNM. The next section discusses the relationship between the presence/absence of という [to iu] and the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause.

1.2.2 という [To iu] and the Modality of the Modifying Clause

This section discusses "modality" in the Japanese language. Teramura (1977b) asserts that in CNM, the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause influence whether or not the addressor includes という [to iu] in a statement. Lyons (1977) defines modality as "the grammaticalization of speakers' subjective attitudes and opinions" (254). Palmer (1986) discusses the distinction between modality and mood: mood is a grammatical category which is restricted to verbal morphology; modality encompasses circumstances beyond verbal morphology. Nitta (1989a) claims that the Japanese language consists of syntactic-semantic structures, 言表事態 [genhyō-jitai] ('the situation of verbal expression') and 言表態度 [genhyō-taido] ('the attitude toward verbal expression'). Nitta (1989a) defines the constituents of verbal expression as the core of the proposition. This core includes voice, aspect, tense and so on. He hypothesizes that tense distinguishes the situation of verbal expression from the attitude toward verbal expression. On the other hand, the attitude toward the verbal expression contained in the CNM determines modality. Noda (1989) defines the order of a sentence-final structure in Japanese as follows:

---

11 However, という [to iu] is not obligatory in outer-relationship/NH-type CNM. This issue is discussed in Sections 1.2.3 and 1.2.4.

The Order of Verbal Expression in a Japanese Sentence-Final Structure

---

**Figure 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the situation of verbal expression</th>
<th>the attitude toward verbal expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[the stem] [voice] [aspect] [affirmative/negative] [tense]</td>
<td>[mood to the situation] [mood to the addressee]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(=Noda 1989:45)

The following example represents the structure shown in Figure 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the situation of verbal expression</th>
<th>the attitude toward verbal expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[食べ] [られ] [てぃ] [なかっ] [た]</td>
<td>[なんだ] [ね]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tabe] [rare] [tet] [nakat] [ta]</td>
<td>[n-da] [ne]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[stem of [taberu]] [passive] [aspect] [negative] [past]</td>
<td>[EMO-CPL] [particle]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[It] was not eaten [by anybody], was it?

If the clause requires "the attitude toward verbal expression" in NH/CNH-type CNM, the utterance requires という[to iu] to make it grammatically correct. Nitta (1995) divides Figure 3's distinct categories into two main sections. Those from [the stem] to [tense] belong to "the situation of verbal expression." The last two segments, "mood to the situation" and "mood to the addressee," belong in the modality category which Nitta defines as the "attitude toward verbal expression." He also states that the latter part of this structure, mood to the addressee, expresses one of the characteristics of a main clause and cannot exist in a subordinate clause.

When analyzing the (non-)use of という[to iu], Teramura (1977b) defines "degree of modality" from a syntactic and morphological point of view. His definition is summarized below: 

---

13 The degree of modality increases as the numbers go up. That is, level 5 has the highest degree of modality whereas level 1 has the lowest degree of modality.
Table 3

Degree of Modality Shown in the Predicate Part of the Japanese Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Modality</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syntactic features</td>
<td>plain form</td>
<td>epistemic modality form</td>
<td>copula form</td>
<td>imperative form</td>
<td>polite form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitta's classification</td>
<td>mood to the situation</td>
<td>mood to the addressee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(=Teramura 1977b: 9)

As shown in Table 3, the area including the imperative form of level 3 to the level 5 degree of modality corresponds to Nitta's mood to the addressee while level 2 and copula of level 3 applies to Nitta's mood to the situation. The modifying clauses in the examples below demonstrate each level of modality. They also include という [to iu] between the modifying clause and its head noun. The underlined parts indicate the words which determine the degree of modality:

Level 5:

(12) sentence-final particle

```
[[仕方がない [て] という] 感じ
[[shikatanai [wa] to iu ] kanji
[[there is no way SF] COMP] feeling
the feeling that shows there is no way
```

(13) sentence-final particle (question particle)

```
[[農業 で 食える 道 はない か] という] 気持ち
[[nōgyō de kueru michi wa nai ka] to iu ] kimochi
[[agriculture INST support oneself way TOP not exist QUE] COMP] feeling
the feeling whether or not there is a way to support themselves by agriculture
```

This thesis employs Teramura's classification when explaining the subtypes of modality in the Japanese language. The modifying clause with level three modality or above always requires という [to iu] in Japanese NH-/CNH-type CNM. This issue will be discussed later in this section. King (personal communication) points out that degrees of modality are not sharply distinct, but that in fact the transition from level to level is a gradual one.

Basically, there are two verbal forms in Japanese: plain and polite. For example, the plain and polite forms of "to speak" or "to say" are いう [iu] and いいます [imasu] respectively.

The plain form of copula だ [da] shows the characteristics of a strong assertion, particularly in a subordinate clause.
Level 4:

(14) polite form

[[ watashi wa zettai ugoki masen ]
[[ TOP absolutely polite form of ugokanai [not to move]] COMP]
the will that I would absolutely not move here

(Tora-chan: 63)

Level 3:

(15) imperative form

[[ shinpai suruna ]
[[ worry imperative form of shinai [not to do]] COMP]
the atmosphere that tells [him] not to worry

(Jidaiya no nyōbo kaidan hen: 169)

(16) copula

[[ fushigina torio da ]
[[ weird trio CPL] COMP]
the face [or facial expression] which shows they are a weird trio.

(Jidaiya no nyōbo kaidan hen: 50)

Level 2:

(17) volitional form

[[ jukyū o chōsei shiyo ]
[[ supply and demand ACC adjustment volitional form of suru [do]] COMP]
the goal that [they] will adjust the supply and demand

(Shokuryō: 87)

(18) epistemic modality

[[ tsugi no kai wa honki o dashite-kuru kamoshirenai to iu ]
[[ next GEN inning TOP earnestness ACC produce-come may be] COMP]
the feeling that [he would] probably pitch with intensity in the next inning

(Shin nejime no baka: 135)
1.2.3 といる [to iu] and Outer-Relationship

Teramura (1977b) claims that it is necessary to consider the semantic characteristics between the head noun and its modifying clause in outer-relationship Japanese CNM. He categorizes the head nouns which appear in outer-relationship CNM according to their semantic properties and assigns each head noun to one of four categories. The table below lists his classification of Japanese CNM head nouns along with representative examples:
### Table 4
List of Head Nouns and Their CNM in Outer-Relationship

[=summary of Teramura (1977b)]

#### I. 発話、思考の名詞 [hatsuwa, shikō no meishi] ('nouns of speech and thought')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>言葉 [kotoba]</td>
<td>命令 [meirei]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>手紙 [tegami]</td>
<td>考え [kangae]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>思い [omoi]</td>
<td>決心 [kesshin]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(20) [[[この 立礼 は 陸五郎 が 書いた] という] 嘘
[[kono tatefuda wa mutsugorō ga kaita] to iu] uwasa
the rumor that Mutsugoro wrote [the message on] the bulletin board
(Teramura 1977b: 12)

#### II. コト性の名詞 [koto-sei no meishi] ('nouns of fact')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>事実 [jijitsu]</td>
<td>事件 [jiken]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>記憶 [kioku]</td>
<td>可能性 [kanōsei]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>過去 [kako]</td>
<td>性格 [seikaku]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(21) [少納言 と 彼女[紫式部] と が 達った] 事実
[shōnagon to kanojo [murasaki shikibu] to ga atta] jijitsu
the fact that Shonagon and she [Murasaki Shikibu] met [each other]
(Teramura 1972: 67)

#### III. 感覚の名詞 [kankaku no meishi] ('nouns of perception')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>単い [nioi]</td>
<td>感触 [kanshoku]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>味 [aji]</td>
<td>写真 [shashin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>姿 [sugata]</td>
<td>絵 [e]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(22) [サナマ を 焼いている] 単い
[sanma o yai-teiru] nioi
the smell of grilling mackerel
(Teramura 1972: 68)

#### IV. 相対性の名詞 [sōtai-sei no meishi] ('nouns of relation')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>上 [ue]</td>
<td>下 [shita]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>前 [mae]</td>
<td>後ろ [ushiro]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>原因 [gen'in]</td>
<td>結果 [kekka]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(23) [彼 が 殺された] 結果, 国中 で 暴動 が 起こった。
[kare ga korosareta] kekka, kunijū de bōdō ga okotta.
As a result of his [having] been killed, riots occurred all over the country.
(Teramura 1972: 68)
Analyzing his examples, Teramura (1977b) recognizes that the head nouns such as examples (20), (21), and (22) show a different relationship with the modifying clause from that such as example (23). Subclassifying outer-relationship CNM into two subtypes, he claims that CNM such as in examples (20), (21) and (22) is content-complement outer-relationship CNM and that CNM such as in example (23) is relational-complement outer-relationship CNM. The structure of CNM in examples (20) and (21) resembles English appositive clauses, but that of (22) and (23) does not. Even though its modifying clause complements the content of its head noun, example (22) cannot be translated as an English appositive clause. The modifying clause in (23) does not represent the content of the head noun 結果 [kekka] ('result'). It shows the reason of the result, an antonym of the result. This type of noun modification does not exist in English.

Teramura also points out that the presence/absence of という [to iu] is a secondary factor in distinguishing content-complement outer-relationship CNM from relational-complement outer-relationship CNM. The presence of the complementizer という [to iu] is always unacceptable in relational-complement outer-relationship CNM. However, the non-use of という [to iu] does not determine whether outer-relationship CNM is content-complement or relational-complement outer-relationship CNM: the presence of という [to iu] can be obligatory, optional or unacceptable in content-complement outer-relationship CNM. When considering the presence/absence of という [to iu] in content-complement outer-relationship CNM, Teramura (1977b) focuses on the following two characteristics within CNM: the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause and the semantic characteristics of the head noun. The following table shows the relationship between outer-relationship CNM and the use of the complementizer という [to iu]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subclassification of outer-relationship</th>
<th>content-complement outer-relationship</th>
<th>relational-complement outer-relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TYPE I</td>
<td>TYPE II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Head Noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>いう</td>
<td>発話、思考の名詞 [hatsuwa shikō no meishi] ('nouns of speech and thought')</td>
<td>コト性の名詞 [koto sei no meishi] ('nouns of fact')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[to iu]'s presence</td>
<td>level three and up</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level two and below</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When analyzing the relationship between the complementizer いう [to iu] and the modifying clause comprehensively, Teramura examines the degree of modality of the modifying clause. If the modifying clause shows a high degree of modality, that is, level three and above, all content-complement outer-relationship CNM require いう [to iu] obligatorily regardless of the type of the head noun as shown in Table 5. However, when the modifying clause shows level 2 and below, CNM with a type I head noun requires いう [to iu] obligatorily, while type II and III head nouns do not. The presence of いう [to iu] is optional in CNM with a type II head noun, whereas its presence is unacceptable in CNM where the head noun is type III. Chapter 3 analyzes the conditions where the presence/absence of いう [to iu] is contingent upon the modifying clause's modality and on the head noun's semantic characteristics respectively and reciprocally.

As discussed above, Teramura's outer-relationship classification is not relevant in analyzing the function of いう [to iu] as a complementizer. As an alternative classification, the next section discusses how Matsumoto considers the relationship between the complementizer いう [to iu] and Japanese CNM.
1.2.4 という [to iu] and NH-type and CNH-Type CNM

As mentioned in Section 1.1.2, Matsumoto (1988a, b) classifies Japanese CNM into three subcategories; CH-, NH-, and CNH-type CNM. One factor considered in her classification is the presence/absence of the complementizer という [to iu] in Japanese CNM. The complementizer という [to iu] must or may be present in NH-type CNM, but it cannot occur in CNH-type CNM. The following table demonstrates the relationship between という [to iu] and her NH- and CNH-type CNM:

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Head Noun</th>
<th>NH-type CNM</th>
<th>CNH-type CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>という [to iu]</td>
<td>optional</td>
<td>unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6, Matsumoto (1988a, b) lists NH-type head nouns as speech act nouns, nouns of thoughts and feelings, and proposition-taking nouns. Teramura's nouns of speech and thought are divided into two categories in her framework: speech act nouns and nouns of thoughts and feelings. These NH-type head nouns function to label what is designated by the modifying clause. Example (2) in Section 1.1.1, an example of outer-relationship Japanese CNM, is also NH-type CNM. I repeat example (2) below:

---

17Matsumoto (1988a, b) does not use the word "optional" when explaining the use of いう [to iu] in NH-type CNM. Nevertheless, Matsumoto (1988b) claims that "the presence of いう [to iu] is neither necessary or sufficient to make an NH-type" CNM (137).

18Based on the definition and the examples they employ in their respective analyses, Teramura's nouns of speech and thought are equivalent to Matsumoto's speech act nouns and nouns of thoughts and feelings. His nouns of fact correspond to Matsumoto's proposition-taking nouns.
As Section 1.2.3 discussed, the head noun in example (24), 話 [hanashi] ('story'), functions to identify the content designated by its modifying clause, 森さんがオタワへ行った [mori-san ga otawa e itta] ('Mr. Mori went to Ottawa'). Also, as shown in example (24), some NH-type CNM takes という [to iu] optionally.

Matsumoto (1988a, b) defines CNH-type CNM as the CNM where both the modifying clause and its head noun complement each other. As shown in Table 6, CNH-type head nouns are classified into relational nouns, quasi-relational nouns, and nouns of perception. She classifies Teramura's nouns of relation into two subtypes: relational nouns and quasi-relational nouns. The unacceptability of the complementizer という [to iu] is another characteristic common to all CNH-type CNM. Matsumoto's CNM classification is consistent with the presence/absence of the complementizer という [to iu]; CNM is of the NH-type if it can take という [to iu]; and of the CNH-type CNM if it cannot. However, she does not focus on the presence/absence of という [to iu] when analyzing NH-type CNM. The next section discusses previous studies on the use and functions of the complementizer という [to iu], particularly in an optional situation.

1.3 The Semantic Characteristics of Optional という [to iu]

Tomura (1985, 1990, 1991) defines いう [to iu] in NH-type CNM as a complementizer, that is, a function word. Before discussing the use and functions of optional いう [to iu],

19Based on the semantic characteristics of the head noun, Section 3.2 discusses the relationship between the head noun and its modifying clause in CNH-type CNM.
Section 1.3.1 examines theories which claim that even function words do influence the meaning of sentences. Section 1.3.2 reviews the functions of optional という [to iu] proposed by Tomura (1985, 1991), Kim (1989), Tokuda (1989), and Oshima (1991). Although their hypotheses based on made-up examples sound persuasive, we do not know for certain if they actually do function in that way in discourse. Furthermore, even in the cases where examples are taken from actual written or oral data, it is impossible to determine the validity of the hypotheses without examining their context. Section 1.3.3 introduces Maynard's (1992, 1993) framework, which analyzes the optional functions of という [to iu] in context.

1.3.1 Function Words and という [to iu]

Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970) and Bolinger (1972, 1977) postulate that a function word can have semantic properties: that is, function words can change the meaning of a sentence. Bolinger (1977) claims that including the English complementizer "that" could influence the meaning of the sentence. Compare the following examples from Bolinger (1977):

(25a) The forecast says it is going to rain. (Bolinger 1977: 11)
(25b) The forecast says that it is going to rain. (Bolinger 1977: 11)

Bolinger (1977) points out that if the speaker "step[s] into a room and want[s] to drop a casual remark about the weather," example (25a) is appropriate whereas example (25b) is not (11). He also adds that example (25b) sounds natural if used as an answer for a question such as "what's the weather tomorrow?" His explanation regarding the English complementizer "that" also supports the theory that analysis based on context is necessary to comprehend why some function words are (not) deliberately used in certain situations.

Following Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970) and Bolinger (1972, 1977), Tomura (1985, 1991) assumes that the complementizer という [to iu] is a function word, which has semantic characteristics. Its presence or absence influences the interpretation and the meaning of the
sentence where CNM is included. Researchers such as Nakau (1973) and Josephs (1976) claim that sentences including という [to iu] are non-factive. Josephs (1976) explains that a modifying clause with という [to iu] represents hearsay and that including という [to iu] introduces "a degree of doubt or a weakening of the speaker's conviction" when it occurs with a factive predicate (359). Refuting Joseph's claim that factivity cannot thoroughly explain いう [to iu]'s use, Terakura (1980, 1984) shows an alternative function of いう [to iu]: it occurs with a "proposition." She defines a proposition as a "conceptual entity like fact": a proposition is subjective whereas a fact is objective. She points out that judging いう [to iu]'s acceptability in CNM proves difficult because its (non-)use is not always the result of syntactic and semantic conditions within CNM. Only the speaker can decide whether or not a certain situation should be depicted as a proposition.

1.3.2. The functions of Optional いう [to iu] Based on Hypothetical CNM

In analyzing the semantic difference between NH-type CNM with and without optional いう [to iu], researchers such as Tomura (1985, 1991), Kim (1989), Tokuda (1989), and Oshima (1991) follow Terakura (1980, 1984). They all agree that the presence/absence of optional いう [to iu] influences the meaning of the CNM. These four also agree that いう [to iu] keeps its basic meaning and still inherits the "quotative" function. However, Tokuda's analysis differs from the other three researchers above in that she sometimes examines the context when explaining why actual written data exclude いう [to iu] in certain NH-type CNM. Section 4.2.2 discusses her example and shows that contextual analysis is necessary in order to comprehend optional いう [to iu]. Tokuda (1989) lists various conditions where いう [to iu] is present in Japanese CNM. She hypothesizes that the addressee adds optional いう [to iu] in Japanese CNM if he/she assumes that the addressee does not know the information expressed in the modifying clause. On the other hand, いう [to iu] is not included when the

---

20 On the function of いう [to iu] which connects two different nouns, Kinsui (1988) clarifies that this いう [to iu] is used to designate information which the listener/reader does not know.
addressor believes that the information is already known to the addressee.

Tomura (1985, 1990) defines the syntactic function of という [to iu] as a complementizer and names its semantic function 抽出機能 [chūshu shuu kinen] ('encapsulating function'). Encapsulating function means that という [to iu] functions to extract the content of the modifying clause from the real world. She hypothesizes that the presence of という [to iu] causes the anti-synchronic and indirect relationship between the modifying clause and its head noun. When the addressor introduces the CNM, he/she senses a mental process, which extracts one specific part from the whole phenomenon. Therefore, only the addressor can determine the presence/absence of optional という [to iu] because it is the addressor who can decide some certain event or state as a whole. Kim (1989) claims that という [to iu] is present when the addressor classifies the content of the modifying clause into one of three types: an abstract concept, indirectness, and a representative of a pattern. She mentions that という [to iu]'s optional use is related to indirectness. Oshima (1991) claims that optional という [to iu] functions to indicate an addressor's subjective impressions such as intention, guess, and doubt. He hypothesizes that when the addressor employs CNM with optional という [to iu], he/she tries to express the situation described in the modifying clause as his/her own comment.

The hypotheses discussed above are mainly derived from made-up examples. Therefore, although they appear convincing, we do not know whether they actually function in that way in actual discourse. Even if the researchers had examined actual written or spoken data, we cannot determine the validity of their hypotheses without the context in which the CNM appears. The use and functions of optional という [to iu] must be examined fully in context in order to verify any hypothesis. The next section will introduce Maynard (1992, 1993), who supplies the context of written data when analyzing the function of optional という [to iu].
1.3.3 という [To iu] as "Discourse Modality Indicator"

Maynard's (1992, 1993) analysis differs from those discussed in Section 1.3.2 in that all of her examples come from actual written data. In addition, when analyzing the use and functions of optional という [to iu], Maynard provides the contextual information where CNM is used. Therefore, her hypothesis is more persuasive than the others discussed above. Maynard (1993) claims that determining whether or not optional という [to iu] is used necessitates "not syntactic but fundamentally a discourse pragmatic" analysis (232). She hypothesizes that という [to iu] is one of the Discourse Modality Indicators and that the complementizer という [to iu] "connects between two modes of interaction, 'saying' and 'describing'" (252).21 Maynard (1993) claims that Discourse Modality is the function of conveying "the speaker's subjective emotional, mental or psychological attitude toward the message content, the speech act itself or toward his or her interlocutor in discourse" (38). According to Maynard (1993), Discourse Modality Indicators are defined as "non-referential linguistic signs whose primary functions are to directly express personal attitude and feelings as characterized by the concept of Discourse Modality" (47).

Maynard (1992, 1993) states that the (non-)use of optional という [to iu] relates to the difference between foregrounded and backgrounded information in CNM. According to Hopper (1979), "foreground" means "the language of the actual story line" or "the parts of the narrative which relate events belonging to the skeletal structure of the discourse" (213). Hopper (1979) claims that "background" refers to "the language of supportive material which does not itself narrate the main events" (213). Based on Hopper (1979), Maynard (1992, 1993) claims that in optional situations, the addressor focuses attention on its modifying clause by including という [to iu]. Conversely, the addressor who excludes という [to iu] in an optional situation focuses

21 Maynard (1993) discusses the following Discourse Modality Indicators: connectives だから [dakara] and だって [datte], modal adverbs やはり [yahari] and やっぱり [yappari], interactional particles よ [yo] and ね [ne]; and styles だ [da] and です／ます [desu/masu].
attention on the head noun. In other words, optional という [to iu] is present in the Japanese CNM when the modifying clause is foregrounded because (1) its information is new or unexpected; (2) its content is relatively important in discourse and the addressee uses という [to iu] in order to add a dramatic emphasis; and (3) the addressee recognizes that someone tries to express the information in the modifying clause as his/her own comment. In the third constraint, what is designated by the modifying clause is interpreted as an utterance within quotations. On the other hand, Japanese CNM without という [to iu] in an optional situation indicates that information contained in the modifying clause does not normally reflect somebody's actual utterance.

This Chapter has reviewed previous research into Japanese CNM and other background information essential to help us comprehend the presence/absence of the complementizer という [to iu] in Japanese CNM. It has also introduced the Japanese CNM classification proposed by Teramura (1975, 1977a, b, 1978) and Matsumoto (1988a, b). Also, it has discussed their analyses of the relationship between the CNM and という [to iu]. The findings here show that neither Teramura's nor Matsumoto's analyses sufficiently explain the distributional constraints of という [to iu] in content-complement outer-relationship or NH-type CNM. Also, it has reviewed previous studies on the use and functions of optional という [to iu]. Maynard's (1992, 1993) analysis points out that examining the context where the CNM is included is indispensable in order to comprehend the (non-)use of the complementizer という [to iu] in an optional situation. The next chapter will determine which terms of Japanese CNM classification will be used in this thesis. It will also introduce a framework for いう [to iu] based on Teramura (1977b), Matsumoto (1988a, b) and Maynard (1992, 1993).

22Her analysis points out that the third reason also applies to the syntactic constraints where the presence of という [to iu] is obligatory in some Japanese CNM. Section 3.1.1 will discuss this issue in detail.
Chapter Two

Terms and Framework of This Thesis

2.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the terms and framework followed in this study. Section 2.1 compares Teramura's (1975, 1977a, b, 1978) classification to Matsumoto's (1978) as they relate to the complementizer という [to iu]. Section 2.2 explains why this thesis employs Matsumoto's terms. Although this study employs Matsumoto's (1988a, b) terms, the concept of "degree of modality" is unique to Teramura's (1977b) analysis. Based on their examinations, Section 2.2 also introduces a tentative framework of this thesis. By combining Matsumoto's Japanese CNM classification and Maynard's concept of Discourse Modality Indicators, Section 2.3 introduces an alternative framework original to this thesis and for the area under discussion.

2.1 Comparison between Teramura's and Matsumoto's Framework

In order to show the difference between Teramura's (19775, 1977a, b, 1978) and Matsumoto's (1988a, b) CNM classification, this section briefly compares the two. The following table shows the difference between their CNM framework:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teramura</td>
<td>inner-relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1975, 77a, b, 1978)</td>
<td>outer-relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsumoto</td>
<td>CH-type CNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1988a, b)</td>
<td>NH-type CNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNH-type CNM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 7, the most significant difference between their respective frameworks is that Teramura's (1977) dichotomy breaks Japanese CNM into inner-relationship and outer-relationship. Also, he subclassifies outer-relationship into two subcategories: content-

1This thesis does not discuss which CNM framework is more thorough because such discussion is not its focus.
complement and relational-complement outer-relationship. On the other hand, Matsumoto (1988a, b) separates Japanese CNM into three, CH-type, NH-type and CNH-type construction. Her classification differs from Teramura's (1975, 1977a, b, 1978) in that she examines CNM which cannot be adequately explained without using her semantic framework. The following table compares Teramura's outer relationship with Matsumoto's NH-/CNH-type CNM as they relate to the complementizer という [to iu]:

**Table 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teramura</th>
<th>Outer-Relationship</th>
<th>Matsumoto</th>
<th>NH-type CNM</th>
<th>CNH-type CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Head Noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech and thought</td>
<td>nouns of content-complement</td>
<td>nouns of relational-complement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perception</td>
<td>nouns of perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsumoto</td>
<td>NH-type CNM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Head Noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech act</td>
<td>nouns of perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nouns of thoughts and feelings</td>
<td>relational nouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposition-taking nouns</td>
<td>quasi-relational nouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 8, one contradiction which this thesis endeavors to resolve is the different ways in which Teramura (1977b) and Matsumoto (1988a, b) interpret CNM where the head noun is a noun of perception. Teramura regards nouns of perception as head nouns included in content-complement outer-relationship CNM. Matsumoto, however, considers nouns of perception as head nouns included in CNH-type CNM. To avoid confusing their frameworks

---

1. Matsumoto (1988a, b), however, does not analyze CNM in context. This distinguishes her analysis from those of Maynard (1992, 1993).

2. Teramura (1977b) comments that という [to iu]'s use can be obligatory, optional, and unacceptable in content-complement outer-relationship CNM, while という [to iu] must not be present in relational-complement outer-relationship CNM. He points out that the presence of という [to iu] is generally unacceptable when a noun of perception is the head noun of content-complement outer-relationship CNM.
and terms, I will determine which framework is more effective in explaining the relationship between CNM and the (non-)use of the complementizer という [to iu] in an optional situation. The next section will introduce the terms and a tentative framework this thesis follows.

### 2.2 Terms Employed in This Thesis

This thesis employs Matsumoto's (1988a, b) Japanese CNM classification. As shown in Table 8, Matsumoto's NH- and CNH-type CNM correspond to the presence and absence of the complementizer という [to iu]. When classifying types of head nouns, this thesis also employs Matsumoto's terms: speech act nouns, nouns of thoughts and feelings, proposition-taking nouns, nouns of perception, relational nouns, and quasi-relational nouns. Her classification is more detailed than Teramura's because Matsumoto (1988a, b) divides Teramura's (1977b) nouns of relation category into two subtypes: relational nouns and quasi-relational nouns.

When examining Japanese CNM, Matsumoto (1988a, b) does not analyze the relationship between という [to iu] and the subclassification of Japanese CNM. Conversely, Teramura (1977b) examines their relationship according to the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause. Specifically, he examines the relationship between という [to iu] and the modifying clause according to the modifying clause's degree of modality. As discussed in Section 1.2.2, Teramura claims that in NH-/CNH-type CNM, the higher the modifying clause's degree of modality, the more necessary という [to iu] becomes. Using his examples, Teramura concludes that if the degree of modality is level three and above, the presence of という [to iu] becomes indispensable. This rule applies no matter what kind of head noun precedes its modifying clause. The following table summarizes the relationship between head noun type and its modifying clause's degree of modality in NH-/CNH-type CNM based on Teramura and Matsumoto:
The Relationship between Head Noun Type and its Modifying Clause's Degree of Modality in NH-/CNH-Type CNM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of CNM</th>
<th>NH-type CNM</th>
<th>CNH-type CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Head Noun</td>
<td>speech act noun</td>
<td>nouns of thoughts and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree of modality</td>
<td>level 5</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the use of という [to iu]</td>
<td>level 4</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level 3</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level 2</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level 1</td>
<td>optional?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 reveals contradictions in the following two areas: (1) という [to iu]'s presence in NH-type CNM where the modifying clause's degree of modality is level two and below, and (2) CNH-type CNM where the head noun is a noun of perception. The first problem closely relates to the main issue of this thesis. In NH-type CNM, the presence of という [to iu] is always obligatory when the degree of modality of its modifying clause is level three and up. When its modality is level two and below, some CNH require という [to iu] obligatorily while others take it optionally. For example, nouns of thoughts and feelings take という [to iu] optionally when the degree of the modality of their modifying clause is level one. Moreover, Tokuda (1989) claims that, in actual written data, some speech act nouns do not always necessitate という [to iu] in NH-type CNM where the modifying clause's degree of modality is level one, although Teramura claims that they require という [to iu] obligatorily. Because

*N/A* means that no modifying clause shows the corresponding degree of modality in CNM as far as my data is concerned, while *unacceptable* means that the modifying clause shows the corresponding degree of modality, but does not occur with という [to iu].
Teramura and Tokuda do not agree regarding whether という [to iu] is obligatory or optional here, I have noted this in Table 9 and have inserted question marks to highlight their lack of consensus. Chapter Four discusses this issue in detail. In order to compensate for the discrepancy discussed above, this thesis introduces the hypothesis that all NH-type CNM take という [to iu] optionally when the degree of modality of its modifying clause is level two and below.

The second problematic area to be examined is in CNH-type CNM where the head noun is a noun of perception. Table 9 shows that CNH-type CNM requires という [to iu] obligatorily where the head noun is a noun of perception and where the modifying clause's degree of modality is level three and above. On the other hand, the other head nouns in CNH-type CNM, relational nouns and quasi-relational nouns, do not occur with the modifying clause where the degree of modality is level two and above. Although the present study focuses on NH-type CNM, I will examine CNH-type CNM where nouns of perception must take という [to iu] in order to compare these two uses of という [to iu].

The following table demonstrates a tentative framework of the current study, that is, how this thesis defines obligatory, optional, and unacceptable という [to iu] in NH-/CNH-type CNM:
Table 10

The use of という [to iu]:
Obligatory, Optional, and Unacceptable という [to iu] in NH-/CNH-type CNM:
Tentative Framework of This Thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of CNM</th>
<th>NH type CNM</th>
<th>CNH type CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Head Nouns</td>
<td>speech act nouns</td>
<td>nouns of thoughts and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree of modality and the use of という [to iu]</td>
<td>level 5</td>
<td>level 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 10, the complementizer という [to iu] appears in NH-/CNH-type CNM. Speech act nouns, nouns of thoughts and feelings, and proposition-taking nouns serve as NH-type head nouns. Nouns of perception, relational nouns, and quasi-relational nouns function as CNH-type head nouns. When the modifying clause's degree of modality is level three and above, という [to iu] is obligatory in either NH-type CNM or in CNH-type CNM where the head noun is a noun of perception. The presence of という [to iu] is optional in NH-type CNM where the modifying clause's degree of modality is level two and below. Its presence is grammatically unacceptable in CNH-type CNM where the modifying clause's degree of modality is level one. Chapter Three examines the use and functions of obligatory and unacceptable という [to iu] while Chapter Four examines optional という [to iu].

2.3 Framework of This Thesis

As discussed in Section 1.3.3, Maynard (1992, 1993) proposes that the presence of optional という [to iu] in NH-type CNM depends on whether the information described in the modifying clause is foregrounded. The following three constraints foreground what is described
by the modifying clause: (1) its information is new or unexpected by the addressee; (2) the addressor wants to give a dramatic effect to the information expressed by the modifying clause because it is much more pragmatically significant than the information in the head noun; and (3) the modifying clause shows one or more of the characteristics of a direct quote because the addressor recognizes that someone is trying to express the modifying clause's information as his/her own comment. In order to make the discussion more concise here, I will label the three constraints when analyzing the context where NH-type is included as follows: (1) new information, (2) dramatic effect, and (3) direct-quote.

Maynard's (1992, 1993) third constraint, direct-quote, requires an alternative framework of this thesis. By examining written data, Tokuda (1989) claims that the presence of という [to iu] is obligatory in CNM when the modifying clause retains the characteristics of a direct quote. As discussed in Section 1.2.2, a high degree of modality of the modifying clause indicates the condition which requires という [to iu] obligatorily. Therefore, the modifying clause which shows level three modality or above points to the inherent characteristics of a direct quote. Based on the findings above, this thesis should modify the framework set out in Section 2.2 as follows:
Table 11
The use of という [to iu]: Alternative Framework of This Thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of CNM</th>
<th>NH-type CNM</th>
<th>CNH-type CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Head Noun</td>
<td>speech act noun</td>
<td>nouns of thoughts and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree of modality</td>
<td>level 5</td>
<td>level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the use of という [to iu]</td>
<td>level 2</td>
<td>level 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional (Direct-Quote)  N/A
Optional  N/A  Unacceptable

As shown in Table 11, this study proposes an alternative hypothesis that all NH-type CNM take という [to iu] optionally. However, when analyzing written data, it is better to divide NH-type CNM into two subcategories: NH-type CNM where the modifying clause's degree of modality is level three and above, and NH-type CNM where the modifying clause's degree of modality is level two and below. When the degree of modality of the modifying clause is level three and above, the presence of optional という [to iu] results from only one constraint: direct-quote. However, when the degree of modality of the modifying clause is level two or below, one or more of the three constraints which make the modifying clause foregrounded should be considered. Therefore, this thesis calls the first type of optional という [to iu] "direct-quote" という [to iu] in order to avoid confusion.

Chapter Three analyzes the conditions of direct-quote and unacceptable という [to iu]. When comprehending the constraints of direct-quote という [to iu], it is necessary to examine both the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause and the semantic properties of the head noun of CNM. Also, when analyzing the conditions of unacceptable という [to iu], it is essential to examine the semantic characteristics of the head noun within CNM. However, when examining the relationship between the head noun and its modifying clause, we must
remember that some CNH-type CNM require shared cultural/social knowledge while others necessitate an analysis based on the context. Chapter Four discusses the constraints of optional という [to iu] in NH-type CNM. The following table demonstrates the area this thesis will discuss:

Table 12

The use of という [to iu]: The Area Discussed in This Thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of CNM</th>
<th>NH-type CNM</th>
<th>CNH-type CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Head Noun</td>
<td>speech act noun</td>
<td>nouns of thoughts and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree of modality and the use of いう [to iu]</td>
<td>level 5</td>
<td>Optional (Direct Quote)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussed in Chapter Three

In the following I explain the reason for excluding NH-type CNM where the degree of modality of the modifying clause is level two. First, Teramura (1977b) claims that if the modifying clause's modality shows level three and above, it retains the characteristics of a direct quote. He, however, never discusses whether level two degree of modality of the modifying clause shows the characteristics of a direct quote or not. Second, all researchers accept that CH-type CNM must not take a modifying clause which shows the characteristics of a direct quote.

When a modifying clause shows level 2 modality, however, some CH-type CNM occur with the modifying clause which demonstrates epistemic modality. These two findings suggest

5 There are three forms of epistemic modality proposed by Teramura (1977b): かもしれない [kamoshirenai] ('it may be so, but I am not certain'), らしい [rashii] ('it appears that'), and だろう [darō] ('it probably will be'). Mihara (1995) points out that the acceptability of these three in CH-type CNM is different. The presence of かもしれない [kamoshirenai] ('it probably will be') is acceptable in CH-type CNM, while that of だろう [darō] ('it probably will be') is marginal or grammatically unacceptable. The acceptability of the presence of らしい [rashii] ('it appears that') lies between them.
that we cannot determine whether or not epistemic modality shows the characteristics of a direct quote. Therefore, the present study excludes the data of NH-type CNM where the degree of modality of the modifying clause is level two.
Chapter Three

という [to iu]: Direct-Quote and Unacceptable Uses

3.0 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the direct-quote and unacceptable use of という [to iu]. As discussed in Chapters One and Two, the complementizer という [to iu] cannot always exist in all NH-type CNM situations. In fact, some NH-type CNM situations do not require the inclusion of という [to iu] in order to make the CNM well-formed. Furthermore, some CNH-type CNM occur with という [to iu] although most of them would be considered grammatically incorrect if という [to iu] were included in the statement. Researchers such as Teramura (1977b), Terakura (1980, 1984), Tomura (1985, 1991), Kim (1989), Tokuda (1989), Oshima (1991) and Matsumoto (1996a, b) examine the conditions where NH-/CNH-type CNM obligates the use of という [to iu]. They also investigate the conditions where という [to iu] is grammatically unacceptable in NH-/CNH-type CNM.

Section 3.1 focuses on the distributional constraints which determine the direct-quote use of という [to iu] in NH-type CNM. Section 3.2 examines CNH-type CNM where the presence of という [to iu] is grammatically unacceptable. The data in Section 3.1 can be analyzed according to the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause and the semantic properties of the head noun. However, some examples in Section 2.2 cannot be adequately explained by syntactic and semantic characteristics within the CNM alone. In order to comprehend the relationship between a head noun and its modifying clause, the examples require an examination of the context and/or the shared knowledge between the addressor and the addressee.

3.1 Direct-Quote という [to iu]

This section examines CNM's conditions where という [to iu] is direct-quote. An understanding of という [to iu]'s direct-quote use requires analyses both of the syntactic conditions within the modifying clause and of the semantic characteristics of certain head nouns. Both
features can be analyzed within the CNM alone. Section 3.1.1 focuses on the syntactic properties of modifying clauses which show the characteristics of an actual utterance. Section 3.1.2 discusses the semantic characteristics of certain head nouns that generally make と in obligatory. For example, speech act nouns by their nature generally require the presence of と in. The semantic characteristics of such head nouns dictate the presence of a high degree of modality within the modifying clause. This syntactic condition obligates the presence of と in. However, there are some speech act nouns in NH-type CNM that do not always occur with と in. Section 3.1.3 provides an example of these situations discussed above.

3.1.1 Conditions of Modifying Clauses Requiring Direct-Quote と in

This section examines the syntactic aspects of modifying clauses which make と in direct-quote. Teramura (1977b, 1981) proposes that if the modifying clause maintains the characteristics of an independent clause, the statement requires と in. Also, Terakura (1980, 1984) examines the characteristics of modifying clauses which require と in obligatorily in NH-type CNM. The following examples demonstrate the syntactic conditions identified by Teramura (1977b) and Terakura (1980, 1984).

In written works, there are two features to show that the modifying clause is a quote outside of the modifying clause. One is quotation marks 「 」 (" ") which encompass the modifying clause; and the other is a comma between the modifying clause and と in. Examples (1) and (2) demonstrate each element respectively:

---

1This classification is adapted from Tokuda (1989).
In example (1), the quotation markers make the modifying clause a direct quotation. Whenever という [to iu] follows a direct quotation, it retains its inherent meaning, "[someone] say[s] that." Therefore, in CNM such as example (1), it is difficult to determine whether という [to iu] functions as a complementizer or as a combination of the particle と [to] and the verb いう [iu] ('to speak' or 'to say').

The presence of a comma in NH-type CNM also obligates the inclusion of という [to iu]. Terakura (1980) speculates that an intonation break, or a pause in speech precedes という [to iu] when people read/hear the corresponding CNM. The comma which divides the modifying clause from the complementizer いう [to iu] corresponds to that pause. Observe the following example:

(2) 自分 が 中 で タッタタ
[[jibun ga naka de tattatta
[[self NOM inside LOC onomatopoeia [to walk forward quickly and with vigor]

to hashire-ba kurukuru to
QUO run-CON onomatopoeia (the actual rotating movement) QUO

kuruma ga kaitensuru], to iu] genri
wheel NOM rotate], COMP principle
the principle that the wheel will rotate quickly and smoothly if [the mouse] runs inside the wheel

(Tora-chan: 190)

The comma between the modifying clause ・・・回転する [・・・kaitensuru] ('to rotate') and いう [to iu] obligates いう [to iu]'s presence in example (2).

A comma must not be included when いう [to iu] follows quotation markers in
NH-type CNM. Compare the following with example (2):

(2') * ["自己が中でタッタタ
"jitbun ga naka de tattatta
self inside LOC onomatopoeia [to walk forward quickly and with vigor]

と走ればクルクル
to hashire-ba kurukuru
QUO run-CON onomatopoeia [the actual rotating movement] QUO

車が回転する]、という]原理
kuruma ga kaitensuru"], to iu] genri
wheel NOM rotate"], COMP principle

* the principle, that the wheel will rotate quickly and smoothly if [the mouse] runs inside the wheel

As shown in example (2)', if the writer puts a comma after direct quotation marks, the corresponding NH-type CNM includes redundant information. In order to make example (2) well-formed, either quotation marks or a comma should precede という [to iu].

Without quotation marks or a comma, the characteristics inside the modifying clause obligate the inclusion of という [to iu]. If the modifying clause comprises an incomplete sentence, it presents one of the syntactic conditions which make という [to iu] direct-quote in NH-type CNM. Observe the following example:

(3) 野田淳子は[[親元からだからから]という]理由
noda junko wa [[oyamoto kara da kara] to iu] riyū
Junko Noda TOP [one's parental home from CPL because] COMP reason

で、...5時半に帰っていい。
de, ... gojihan ni kae-tte ii.
CPL ... a half past five DAT TOP return-ing good.
Junko Noda can return home at 5:30 because [she commutes] from her parents' home....

(Dī-shī satsujin jiken: 194)

The modifying part in example (3), 親元からだから [oyamoto kara da kara] ('because [she commutes] from her parents' home') is a subordinate clause. In order to make the modifying part in example (3) grammatically appropriate, the addressor has to add another clause such as 早く帰らないと親が心配する [hayaku kaeranaito oya ga shinpai suru] (her parents are worried about her when she does not return home early') as a main clause. Terakura (1980) proposes
that an incomplete statement that comprises a modifying clause requires the presence of いう [to iu]. However, she merely states this fact and does not consider why いう [to iu] is always direct-quote after the modifying clause which is an incomplete sentence. Matsumoto (1988b), on the other hand, claims that いう [to iu] functions as a complement marker similar to quotation marks or quasi-quotation marks. She analyzes that いう [to iu] following an incomplete sentence retains its basic function as marking quotation and possesses its inherent meaning by combining the quotative particle と [to] and the verb いう [iu] ('to speak' or 'to say'). Therefore, when the modifying clause comprises an incomplete sentence, いう [to iu] is required to identify the CNM as a quote.

The following modifying clause shows another constraint where the use of いう [to iu] is direct-quote in NH-type CNM. Teramura (1981) claims that the modifying clause in NH-type CNM occurs with いう [to iu] when it includes the topic particle は [wa]. Consider the following example:

(4) [[今度 は ちょっと 違う] いう] 気
[[kondo  wa  chotto  chigau]  to iu]  ki
[[this time TOP a little different] COMP] feeling
the feeling that it will be a little different this time (Jidaiya no nyōbo kaidan hen: 10)

In Japanese CNM, a subordinate clause must not include the topic case marker は [wa]. Therefore, if the addressor includes the particle は [wa] in the modifying clause, the corresponding modifying clause should be classified as a independent clause.

As discussed in Section 1.2.2, when the modifying clauses show a level 3 degree of modality or above, they retain the characteristics of a direct quotation. I repeat examples (12) to (16) from Chapter One as examples (5) to (9):

\[\text{For further details of the relationship between the topic case marker は [wa] and the Japanese clause, see Kuroda (1972), Kuno (1973, 1976), and Oshima (1991).}\]
Level 5

(5) sentence-final particle

[[仕方ない わ という 感じ
[[shikatanai wa to iu] kanji
[[there is no way SF] COMP] feeling
the feeling that shows there is no way

(Jidaiya no nyōbo kaidan hen: 47)

(6) sentence-final particle (question particle)

[[農業 で 食える 道 は ない か] という] 気持ち
[[nōgyō de kueru michi wa nai ka] to iu] kimochi
[[agriculture INST support oneself way TOP not exist QUE] COMP] feeling
the feeling whether or not there is a way to support themselves by agriculture

(Shokuryō: 156)

Level 4

(7) polite form

[[私 は 絶対 動きません]]
[[watashi wa zettai ugokimasen]]
[[I TOP absolutely polite form of ugokanai ('not to move')] COMP] will
the will that I would absolutely not move here

(Tora-chan: 63)

Level 3

(8) imperative form

[[心配 するな]]
[[shinpai suruna]]
[[worry imperative form of shinai ('not to do')] COMP] atmosphere
the atmosphere that tells [him] not to worry

(Jidaiya no nyōbo kaidan hen: 169)

(9) copula

[[不思議な トリオだ]]
[[fushigina torio da] to iu] kao
[[weird trio CPL] COMP] face
the face [or facial expression] which shows they are a weird trio.

(Jidaiya no nyōbo kaidan hen: 50)

The modifying clause in NH-type CNM sometimes shows two or more syntactic constraints which make という [to iu] direct-quote. Observe the following examples:

(10) [[農業 は 劣等 の 職業] という] 感覚
[[nōgyō wa rettō no shokugyō] to iu] kankaku
[[agriculture TOP inferior GEN occupation] COMP] sense
the sense that agricultural work [is] an inferior occupation

(Shokuryō : 198)
The modifying part in example (10), "職業という感覚 [shokugyō to iu kankaku] looks like a "Noun という [to iu] Noun," structure. However, Japanese native speakers regard the modifying part in example (10) as the clause where the writer deletes the copula だ [da] at the end of the modifying constituent as in example (10'). The presence of という [to iu] in example (10) can be explained by the fact that the modifying clause shows the following two characteristics of a direct quote: (1) an incomplete sentence and (2) a high degree of modality.

The following provides another condition within a modifying clause which requires いう [to iu] obligatorily. Tokuda (1989) claims that いう [to iu] is included in NH-type when the addressor wants to emphasize the CNM as not CH- but NH-type CNM. The following are originally in Tokuda (1989):

(11) [[東西 の 緊張緩和 に 役立つ] という 考え
[[East and West GEN tension relaxation DAT useful] opinion
the opinion that [something is] useful in order to ease the tensions between the East and the West

(12) [東西 の 緊張緩和 に 役立つ] 考え
[East and West GEN tension relaxation DAT useful] opinion
(12a) CH-type CNM
the idea which is useful to ease the tensions between East and West
(12b) NH-type CNM (=11)
the opinion that [something is] useful in order to ease the tensions between the East and the West
(cited in Tokuda 1989: 48)

As shown in examples (11) and (12), Tokuda (1989) claims that example (11) can be classified only as NH-type CNM, whereas example (12) has two interpretations: NH- and CH-type CNM.³

³In spite of Tomura's (1989) claim, seven Japanese native speakers out of fifteen stated that only CH-type interpretation is acceptable when asked for their interpretation of example (12). However, thirteen out of fifteen accept the two interpretations of example (5) as discussed in Chapter One:
In example (11), the modifying clause 東西の緊張緩和に役立つ [tōzai no kinchō kanwa ni yakudatsu] ('[something is] useful in order to ease the tensions between East and West') complements the content of the head noun 考え [kangae] ('opinion'). Matsumoto (1988b) states that the head noun 考え [kangae] ('opinion/idea') in NH-type CNM is a "frame-evoking" noun. In other words, the word elicits a frame where "it labels or encapsulates a proposition" (Matsumoto 1988b: 52). Because of their specific semantic characteristics, certain head nouns require some form of complement. The modifying clause supplies the required complement. Hence, some CNM head nouns necessitate a modifying clause that maintains a high degree of modality. In turn, these conditions obligate the use of という [to iu].

While example (11) is NH-type CNM, example (12) can be interpreted as CH-type CNM (12a) or NH-type CNM (12b). The head noun 考え [kangae] ('opinion/idea') can have a case relationship with its modifying clause because of its semantic properties. Example (12a) can be paraphrased as follows:

(12) [その] 考え が 東西 の 緊張緩和 に 役立つ。
(sono) kangae ga tōzai no kinchō kanwa ni yakudatsu.
(The idea is useful in order to ease the tensions between East and West.

As shown in example (12)', the head noun 考え [kangae] ('opinion/idea') from example (12) can be the subject of the predicate of the modifying clause, 役立つ [yakudatsu] ('be useful'). In

(i) [夜 トイレ に 行けなくなる] 話
[yoru toire ni ikenaku-naru] hanashi
[night bathroom LOC go-cannot-become] story

(ii) CH-type interpretation
the story [because of hearing] which [one] becomes unable to go to the bathroom at night

(iii) NH-type interpretation
the story that [somebody] becomes unable to go to the bathroom at night
(=example (5) in Section 1.1.3)

(Matsumoto 1988b: 94)

Collier-Sanuki (personal communication) explains that the different interpretations between examples (12) and (i) occur because of the verbs in the modifying clause: both 役立つ [yakudatsu] ('be useful') and 行けなくなる [ikenakunaru] ('become unable to go') require an agent in these clauses. The head noun in example (12) 考え [kangae] ('opinion/idea') can be regarded as the straightforward agent of 役立つ [yakudatsu] ('be useful'). On the other hand, 話 [hanashi] ('story') cannot be the subject of 行けなくなる [ikenakunaru] ('become unable to go').
this situation, という [to iu] must not be present because such a case relationship comprises a
typical characteristic of CH-type CNM. Therefore, if the addresser wants to emphasize the
CNM's relationship as NH-type CNM, the presence of という [to iu] is preferable. The writer,
therefore, includes という [to iu] because he or she does not want the reader to misinterpret the
information.

In summary, this section analyzed how the syntactic characteristics of the modifying
clause influence the presence of the complementizer という [to iu]. This study reconfirms that
Maynard's (1992, 1993) hypothesis on optional という [to iu] can clarify why the presence of という [to iu] is direct-quote in NH-type CNM. All syntactic elements discussed in this section
can be explained by her third condition, that is, direct-quote. Therefore, optional いう [to iu] is present when the modifying clause retains the characteristics of direct-quote. As mentioned
in Chapter One, this relates to the presence of the particle と [to] which indicates both direct
quotation and indirect quotation. In addition, いう [to iu] is inserted when the addressor does
not want the addressee to misinterpret some NH-type CNM as CH-type CNM. The next
section will show how the semantic characteristics of certain head nouns obligate いう [to iu]
within NH type CNM.

3.1.2 Speech Act Nouns

The semantic characteristics of head nouns also influence the presence/absence of いう [to iu]. As discussed in Chapter Two, this thesis classifies head nouns used in NH-type
Japanese CNM into three subtypes: (1) speech act nouns; (2) nouns of thoughts and feelings;
and (3) proposition-taking nouns. This section focuses on speech act nouns because Teramura
(1977b) claims that speech act nouns almost always follow いう [to iu] in NH-type CNM.
He states that most speech act nouns are derived from verbs of speaking or can be used as
verbs by adding the verb する [suru] ('to do'). Consider the following table adapted from

4Teramura (1977b) claims that the verbs derived from nouns of thoughts and feelings show the same characteristics
Table 13

Speech Act Nouns and Their Corresponding Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hanashi</td>
<td>hanasu ('to speak' or 'to say')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kotoba</td>
<td>iu ('to tell')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hōkoku</td>
<td>hōkoku suru ('to report')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chūkoku</td>
<td>chūkoku suru ('to advise')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uwasa</td>
<td>uwasa suru ('to rumor')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Teramura 1977b: 7)

All of the verbs in Table 13 take the quotative particle と [to] when a clause precedes them. If one nominalizes the verb, the verb いう [iu] ('to speak' or 'to say') follows the particle と [to] and it is regarded as the complementizer という [to iu]. The following examples from Teramura show these two conditions:

(13a)  |
| ヨシタ 方 ガ イイ | ト | 忠告スル |
| yoshita hō ga ii | to | chūkoku suru |
| [don't do direction NOM good] QUO advise |
| I advise [somebody that it is] better not to do [so]. | (Teramura 1977b: 7)

(13b)  |
| ヨシタ 方 ガ イイ | トイ | 忠告 |
| yoshita hō ga ii | to | chūkoku |
| [don't do direction NOM good] COMP advice |
| the advice that [teaches somebody that it is] better not to do [so] | (Teramura 1977b: 7)

Examples (13a and 13b) suggest that という [to iu] serves the same function as the quotative particle と [to] と [To] functions in a statement to mark a recitation or a quote or a quasi-quotation of another’s remark. Therefore, as discussed in Section 3.1.1, という [to iu] maintains と [to]'s inherent function to some extent.6

6 Teramura, however, also classifies some nouns of speech such as 話 [hanashi] ('speech' or 'story') as nouns of fact because they do not always require という [to iu] in Japanese CNM. Chapter Four discusses this issue in detail.

6 Collier-Sanuki, Déchaine, and King (personal communication) point out that some direct-quote という [to iu] function to show the characteristics between a combination of a quotative と [to] and the verb いう [iu] ('to speak') and the complementizer という [to iu]. The question of how the complementizer という [to iu] is different from という [to iu] used as hearsay is outside the scope of the present study.
Teramura (1977b) also indicates that some speech act nouns usually occur with the modifying clauses which show a high degree of modality. As discussed in Section 3.1.1, a high degree of modality of the modifying clause emerges as one of the three constraints of optional [to iu] in NH-type CNM. Note the following examples where the head nouns are speech act nouns in NH-type CNM. The underlined words show the high degree of modality of the modifying clause:

(14) どこか 見物 に 行く 場所 は ない 手に いう] 今井さん

[[dokoka kenbutsu ni iku basho wa nai ka] to iu] imai-san
[[anywhere sight-seeing DAT go place TOP not exist QUE] COMP] Mr. Imai

no shitsumon
gen question

Mr. Imai's question that asks if there is any place for sight-seeing

(Jidaiya no nyōbo kaidan hen: 162)

(15) 英語 を 効率よく 技術 として 教えよ]

[eigo o koritsu yoku gijutsu toshite oshieyo]

[[English ACC efficiently skill as imperative form of oshieru ('to teach')] ]

求 petty

to iu] yōkyū

COMP requirement

the requirement that [teachers] should teach English efficiently as a skill

(Usagi no sakadachi: 162)

(16) 無条件 に M 番地 へ 飛べ]

[mujōken ni M-banchi e tobe],

[[unconditionally DAT M-address LOC imperative form of tobu ('to jump')] ]

命令

meirei

command

the command which orders 'Jump to M-address unconditionally'

(Konpyūtā nyūmon: 139)

All the head nouns above are speech act nouns. In example (14), the meaning of the head noun 質問 [shitsumon] ('question') demands an interrogative clause. An interrogative clause necessitates the interrogative sentence-final particle か [ka], and therefore maintains a level five degree of modality. The head nouns such as those in examples (15) and (16), 要求 [yōkyū] ('requirement') and 命令 [meirei] ('command'), almost always require the imperative form of modifying clause
such as 敎えよ [oshieyo] ('Teach!') and 飛べ [tobe] ('Jump!'). In NH-type CNM, imperative forms occupy a level three degree of modality. They require という [to iu] obligatorily regardless of the semantic qualities of the head nouns. If the modifying clause's predicate indicates a level one degree of modality, the grammatical acceptability becomes marginal regardless of という [to iu]'s presence. Compare the following examples with examples (15) and (16):

(15) ??[[英語 を 効率よく 技術 として 敎える] という] 要求
  [[[eigo o kōritsu-yoku gijutsu toshite oshieru] to iu] yōkyū]
  [English ACC efficiently skill as teach] COMP requirement
  the requirement that (teachers) teach English efficiently as a skill

(16) ??[[無条件 に M番地 へ 飛ぶ] という] 命令
  [[[mujōken ni M-banchi e tobu], to iu] meirei]
  [unconditionally DAT M-address LOC jump] COMP command
  the command that (something) jumps to M-address unconditionally

In examples (15)' and (16)', the modifying clause's degree of modality is at level one, plain form. The modality of these modifying clauses does not follow the general rules regarding their head nouns' semantic characteristics. Therefore, as Matsumoto (1988a, b) claims, a thorough understanding of Japanese CNM requires a semantic and a pragmatic analysis as well as a syntactic analysis of the head noun and its modifying clause.

This section examined the semantic characteristics of speech act nouns which require the presence of という [to iu] in NH-type CNM. Teramura (1977b) claims that という [to iu] is present because speech act nouns somehow retain the characteristics of their corresponding verbs. These verbs follow the quotative particle と [to]. Moreover, because of their inherent meaning, speech act nouns occur with modifying clauses which show a high degree of modality. I believe, however, that this observation oversimplifies the distributional constraints where という [to iu] is present. As Tomura (1989) points out, speech act nouns do not always occur with という [to iu] in actual written data. This exception will be presented in the next section.

3.1.3 Exceptions to the Rule in NH-Type CNM

According to Teramura (1977b), the presence/absence of という [to iu] depends on both
the semantic characteristics of the head noun and the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause. As discussed in Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, he concludes that speech act nouns generally require `to iu` obligatorily regardless of the modifying clauses's degree of modality. Actual written data, however, reveal exceptions. For example, Teramura (1977b), Song (1979, 1982), and Terakura (1984) regard the word `uwasa` (‘rumor’) as a head noun which always occurs with `to iu`. Tokuda (1989), however, cites Takahashi’s (1979) data and points out an example where the head noun `uwasa` (‘rumor’) exists without `to iu` in NH-type CNM:

(17) そうだ さえ頭の 官員さん の 家 で
[soiu zensei no kan'in-san no ie de]
[like that the zenith of prosperity GEN government clerk GEN house LOC]

お姫さん 同様に かわいがられて 業夜 している] 嗔
ojōsan dōyōni kawaigararete eyō shi-teiru] uwasa
[stories [rumor in the literal translation] that showed [Suga] cherished as a daughter in the home of this government official now at the height of his influence](Onnazaka: 36. Translation by John Bester 1984: 63) (cited in Takahashi 1979: 68)

The modifying clause in example (17) そうだ さえ頭の 官員さんの 家 でお姫さん 同様に かわいがられて 業夜 している] 嗔 [soiu zensei no kan'in-san no ie de ojōsan dōyō ni kawaigararete eyō shiteiru] (‘[Suga] cherished as a daughter in the home of this government official now at the height of his influence’) complements the content of the head noun `uwasa` (‘rumor’). As discussed in Section 3.1.2, the complementizer という `to iu` is present in NH-type CNM where the head noun is a speech act noun such as `uwasa` (‘rumor’) and 命令 `meirei` (‘command’). In example (17), however, the head noun `uwasa` (‘rumor’) does not follow という `to iu` and yet the CNM is grammatically acceptable for Japanese native speakers. The main issue of this thesis is closely related to this problem. Chapter Four examines why Japanese native speakers regard this non-use of という `to iu` as grammatically correct in NH-type CNM such as example (17). Before this matter is discussed, the next section focuses on another distributional constraint of という `to iu`. It examines the semantic characteristics of the head nouns in
CNH-type CNM and investigates how these head nouns relate to their modifying clauses.

3.2 Unacceptable という [to iu]

This section examines Japanese CNM where the inclusion of という [to iu] would be grammatically unacceptable. Matsumoto (1988a, b) labels such CNM as CNH-type. CNH-type CNM exhibits the following characteristics: (1) no case relationship exists between the head noun and its modifying clause; (2) the head noun and the modifying clause evoke a frame reciprocally and host each other mutually; and (3) the presence of という [to iu] is not acceptable. Based on Matsumoto (1988a, b), this thesis classifies CNH-type head nouns into three subtypes: (1) relational nouns; (2) quasi-relational nouns; and (3) nouns of perception. The following three sections, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3, focus on the semantic characteristics of each CNH-type head noun respectively. These sections also investigate the reciprocal relationship between head nouns and their modifying clauses. Section 3.2.4. discusses some exceptions of CNH-type CNM where という [to iu] is present between the modifying clause and its head noun.

3.2.1 Relational Nouns

Matsumoto (1988a, b) defines relational nouns as those "whose meaning is understood relative to some event or state." This thesis proposes that when a relational noun functions as the head noun in CNH-type CNM, the addressee must receive or perceive the information immediately following the CNM in order to comprehend it. In order to give a clearer understanding of CNH-type CNM where relational nouns serve as the head nouns, this thesis subclassifies the nouns into two categories: nouns of spatial-temporal relation and those of cause-effect relation. Both categories are further divided into nouns with and without antonyms. Note the table below which summarizes these four divisions.7

7 Teramura (1977, 1980) also proposes a list of relational nouns, but does not label them.
Table 14

Subclassification of Relational Nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns of Relation</th>
<th>Spatial-Temporal Relation</th>
<th>Cause-Effect Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Antonyms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>上[nue]</td>
<td>(‘top’)</td>
<td>原因[gen'in]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>下[shita]</td>
<td>(‘down’)</td>
<td>理由[riyû]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>前[mae]</td>
<td>(‘precedence’)</td>
<td>要因[yôin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>後ろ[ushiro]</td>
<td>(‘subsequence’)</td>
<td>結果[kekka]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Without Antonyms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>途中[tochû]</td>
<td>(‘in the middle’)</td>
<td>悲しみ[kanashimi]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>帰り[kaeri]</td>
<td>(‘return’)</td>
<td>罪悪感[zaiakukan]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>夜[yoru]</td>
<td>(‘night’)</td>
<td>条件[jôken]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>隣[tonari]</td>
<td>(‘adjacency’)</td>
<td>方法[hôhô]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples below demonstrate CNH-type CNM where a relational noun functions as the head noun. Each example represents one of the four subclassifications of relational nouns. Examining them respectively clarifies why people must receive the information which follows the corresponding CNM in order to comprehend the meaning of the sentence. The underlined words in the examples below belong to the four subtypes mentioned above.

The following CNH-type CNM includes a head noun which shows spatial-temporal relation:

(18) [先 に 進む] 前 に、ここ で 入力装置 と
    [saki ni susumu] mae ni, koko de nyûryoku-sôchi to
    [the sequel DAT advance] precession DAT, this LOC input-equipment and

    出力装置 に ついて 説明しよう。
    shutburyoku-sôchi ni tsuite setsumei-shiyô.

The modifying clause in example (18) 先に進む [saki ni susumu] (‘[I] advance to the sequel’), for example, does not express the content of the head noun 前 [mae] (‘precedence’). 前 [Mae] (‘precedence’) is a temporal relational word which has an antonym, 後ろ [ushiro] (‘subsequence’).

It functions as the English preposition or conjunction, "before." The matrix sentence, ここで入
I will explain about input-equipment and output-equipment here. Example (18) occurs at the beginning of a computer book where the writer first tries to explain the equipment. The semantic characteristics of the head noun in example (18) demand information on an event which occurs before a given point in time. The following figure summarizes the situation in example (18):

Figure 4
The Relationship between the Modifying Clause and the Matrix Clause in Example (18)

| a given point | explain about the equipment | advance to the sequel |

The head noun in example (18) infers that some action will occur in the main clause after what is expressed in the modifying clause. In addition, the modifying clause requires the information supplied by the head noun. Therefore, relational nouns show characteristics peculiar to CNH-type head nouns: (1) no case relationship exists between the head noun and its modifying clause; (2) the head noun and the modifying clause evoke a frame reciprocally and host each other mutually; and (3) the presence of という [to iu] is not acceptable before the head noun.

Although the noun does not have an antonym, the following example also takes a noun of spatial-temporal relation as its head noun:

(19) [そんな 話 を きいた] 夜, となり の 立木さん の
[sonna hanashi o kiita] yoru, tonari no tachiki-san no
[like that story ACC listened] night, next door GEN Mr. Tachiki GEN

部屋 から 人 の 声 が 聞こえてきた。
heya kara hito no koe ga kikoete-kita.

(19a) I heard a story like that [in the afternoon]. At night on the same day, I heard someone's voice in the adjacent room, Mr. Tachiki's room.

(19b) At the night when I heard a story like that, I listened to someone's voice, in the adjacent, Mr. Tachiki's room.  

(Kodomo no tonari: 29)

Even though it does not have a clearly defined antonym, the head noun 夜 [yoru] ('night') in
example (19) is also a relational noun. 夜 [yoru] ('night') does not demand information regarding the event or source which happens before the night because it does not have such a semantic feature. Without knowing the context, readers may interpret example (19) as (19b) not (19a). Example (19b)'s interpretation results from classifying example (19) as CH-type CNM. That is, the head noun 夜 [yoru] ('night') has a case relationship with the modifying clause, そんな話を聞いた [sonna hanashi o kiita] ('I heard a story like that'). It can be paraphrased as follows:

(19) 夜 に そんな話を聞いた。
    yoru ni sonna hanashi o kiita.
[I] heard a story like that at night.

No native speaker/reader, however, would confuse example (19a)'s meaning with (19b)'s. The sentence in example (19) comes from the story of a girl suffering from a serious heart disease. A middle aged man, 立木さん [tachiki-san] ('Mr. Tachiki'), is another patient next door. They talk about Mr. Tachiki's wife in the afternoon and at night the girl listens to a voice coming from Mr. Tachiki's room. The head noun, 夜 [yoru] ('night'), comes after the action described by the modifying clause and before the action expressed by the main clause. The action expressed by the modifying clause occurs before night comes. Hence, in example (19) the information expressed earlier in the story is inferred or understood better than the information contained in the CNM.

Another subtype of relational nouns is cause-effect relation. Observe the following two examples which use nouns of cause-effect relation as their head nouns:

(20) [里親を探した] 結果、我家に白羽の矢が立ったのである。
    [satooya o sagashita] kekka, wagaya ni shiraha no ya ga tatta-no-dearu.
[a foster parent ACC searched for] result, my home DAT a white feather GEN arrow NOM mark-EMO-CPL.
As a result of [her] search for a foster parent [for her mouse], my home was chosen.

(Tora-chan: 177)
Although both examples employ cause-effect relation nouns, example (20)'s head noun has an antonym, while example (21)'s does not. In example (20) the phrase following the head noun, not the modifying clause, complements the content of the head noun, 結果 [kekka] ('result'). The modifying clause 里親を探した [satooya o sagashita] ('[she] searched for a foster parent') does not describe the head noun, 結果 [kekka] ('result'). Instead, the matrix clause 我家に白羽の矢が立ったのである [wagaya ni shiraha no ya ga tatta-no-dearu] ('my home was chosen') describes the result. Therefore, we may assume that the head noun 結果 [kekka] ('result') requires two clauses: one clause that expresses its cause and the other that expresses its result. Teramura (1977b) observes that CNH-type CNM such as example (20) is very common in Japanese while it does not occur in English. Some head nouns in this CNH-type CNM express emotion or one of the senses.\(^8\) The head noun in example (21) 罪悪感 [zaiakukan] ('guilt') also expresses emotion. The modifying clause 忠春に、悪いのはあなたじゃないって言えなかった [tadaharu ni warui-no wa anata ja-nai tte i-e-na-katta] ('[she=the narrator of the story] could not tell Tadaharu that it was not his fault') explains the reason why the subject of example (21)'s sentence feels guilt(y), which is the content expressed in the head noun. The matrix clause なくなる [nakunaru] ('vanish'), on the other hand, reveals the effect of the emotion expressed by the head noun. The head noun 罪悪感 [zaiakukan] ('guilt') requires a concrete event or state which causes the emotion.

Before moving on to the next section, I should clarify the difference between spatial-

---

\(^8\)Kim (1989) classifies this type of head noun as 原因名詞 [gen'in meishi] ('nouns of reason').
temporal and cause-effect relational nouns. Spatial-temporal relational nouns appear only in CNH-type construction. However, some cause-effect relational nouns such as 結果 [kekka] ('result') and 理由 [riyō] ('reason') function as NH-type and CNH-type head nouns. Example (20) is repeated below as example (22). Compare the following two examples because example (22) is CNH-type CNM while example (23) is NH-type CNM:

(22) [里親を探した] 結果、我家に白羽の矢が立ったのである。
[a foster parent ACC searched for] result, my home DAT a white feather GEN

As a result of [her] search for a foster parent [for her mouse], my home was chosen.

(23) 『動物実験で、こんどは AF2 の発がん性を裏づける』結果が出てしまった。
animal experiment LOC, this time TOP [AF2 GEN cancer-causing] support] result NOM come out-finished.

Through animal experimentation, this time [they] have discovered the consequence, which supports the cancer-causing effect of AF2.

The main clause in example (22), 我家に白羽の矢が立ったのである [wagaya ni shiraha no ya ga tatta-no-dearu] ('my house was chosen') expresses the result. The head noun in example (22) belongs in the category of CNH-type head nouns. In such cases, the result is not expressed in the modifying clause. Conversely, the modifying clause in example (23) AF2の発がん性を裏づける [efu tsu' no hatsugansei o urazukeru] ('[it] supports the cancer-causing effect of AF2') expresses the content of the head noun, 結果 [kekka] ('result'). The head noun in example (23) functions to label the event activated by the modifying clause. Even though the head noun in both examples is the same, it functions differently. Thus, it should be classified in different categories: 結果 [kekka] ('result') in example (22) is regarded as a relational noun; but that in example (23) as a proposition-taking noun. Another difference between examples (22) and
(23) is that example (22) cannot take という [to iu] between the modifying clause and its head noun whereas example (23) takes it between them optionally. Chapter Four will discuss the semantic characteristics of head nouns such as the one found in example (23). It also examines how the presence/absence of という [to iu] in example (23) influences the meaning of the CNM.

As discussed in this section, some relational nouns are used as the head noun only in CNH-type CNM, whereas others are present in NH-type also. According to the classification in Table 14, if the head noun expresses a spatial-temporal relation and has an antonym, it is always present in CNH-type CNM. The other three categories of relational nouns may be either NH-type or CNH-type CNM. Therefore the addressee must analyze both the internal structure of CNM and/or the context in which the CNM appears in order to properly comprehend the meaning of the sentence. In addition, shared knowledge between the addressee and the addressee is necessary for the addressee to comprehend thoroughly the relationship between the modifying clause and its head noun in CNH-type CNM. Also, the presence/absence of という [to iu] gives the addressee a secondary clue in understanding which type of CNM is being used. The next section examines another CNH-type CNM where the head noun is a quasi-relational noun, which requires the addressee to share with the writer/speaker cultural knowledge or "world-view" in Matsumoto's (1988a, b) term.

3.2.2 Quasi-Relational Nouns

Matsumoto (1988b) defines quasi-relational nouns as nouns which seem "very much like regular non-relational nouns" (164). However, the relationship between quasi-relational nouns and their modifying clause requires "world-view," the shared knowledge of a language or a culture among people. Although quasi-relational nouns do not have relational words or concepts inherent in their meaning, they exhibit the same relationship with their modifying
clauses as do some relational nouns such as 結果 [kekka] ('result'). The modifying clause expresses the cause of the state expressed by the head noun. The presence of という [to iu] is unacceptable between the head noun and its modifying clause. The following is an example of CNH-type CNM where the head noun is a quasi-relational head noun. It demonstrates why semantic and pragmatic understanding is essential in comprehending Japanese CNM:

(24) タバコを買った お釣り
[cigarette ACC bought] change
the change [from] buying cigarettes

(Teramura 1977b: 32)
(repeated in Matsumoto 1988b: 10)

Example (24) is what Teramura (1977b) merely raised as a type of problematic example which should be analyzed by further study. Matsumoto (1988a, b) analyzes example (24) in terms of a semantic and pragmatic framework the relationship between the head noun and its modifying clause. The head noun お釣り [otsuri] ('change') implies that someone bought something, paid a larger amount of money than the price of the goods, and received change. The action of the modifying clause, タバコを買った [tabako o katta] ('having bought cigarettes') allows the addressee to expect the "change" since this commercial transaction is a source or a reason of getting the change. Both the head noun and the modifying clause in example (24) evoke a frame reciprocally and host each other mutually. Therefore, the CNM in example (24) shows a CNH-type construction. As shown in example (24), CNH-type CNM does not take という [to iu] between the head noun and its modifying clause.

The following is another example of CNH-type CNM where the head noun is a quasi-relational noun:

(25) 这いは、 [死体 を 引きずった] 足 と 考えられなくもない。
this TOP [dead body ACC dragged] trace QUO think-can-not-also-not.
We may regard this as the trace left by dragging the body.

(Akai kumo densetsu satsujin jiken: 27)

Matsumoto (1988b) also states that the CNM where the head noun is a quasi-relational noun "lies at intermediate points on a continuum between CH-type and more prototypical CNH-type" CNM (166).
When construing the relationship between the head noun and its modifying clause the semantic characteristic of the head noun in example (25), 跡 [ato] ('trace') indicates some action causing a mark. The modifying clause explains that someone had dragged a body, that is, leaving the trace. Therefore, the pieces of information expressed in both elements supplement each other.

As shown in examples (24) and (25), the relationship between a quasi-relational noun and its modifying clause varies because its relationship is interpreted not only by the structure within the CNM but also by the shared knowledge, or "world-view." To pursue the relationship between quasi-relational nouns and their modifying clauses would involve us in discussions other than the use and functions of という [to iu]. The important point to note in this section is that quasi-relational nouns create CNH-type CNM which functions relatively similar to CNM where the head noun is a relational noun: a quasi-relational noun does not include という [to iu] in CNH-type CNM. The next section examines the last category of CNH-type head nouns: nouns of perception, and its relationship with the modifying clause.

3.2.3 Nouns of Perception

As discussed in Chapter One, Teramura (1977b) and Matsumoto (1988a, b) propose different explanations when analyzing CNM where the head noun is a noun of perception. First, this section introduces both researchers' assumptions in chronological order. Both Teramura (1977b) and Matsumoto (1988a, b) define nouns of perception as nouns associated with physical perception such as 姿 [sugata] ('appearance, figure'), 形 [katachi] ('shape'), 色 [iro] ('color'), 音 [oto] ('sound'), 香い [nioi] ('smell'), 様相 [kanshoku] ('touch'), 感じ [kanji] ('feeling') and so on. They also includes words such as 絵 [e] ('picture'), 写真 [shashin] ('photograph') and 光景 [kōkei] ('scene') because these nouns describe what the addressee actually perceives. The following examples demonstrate CNH-type CNM where nouns of perception function as head nouns. Observe the absence of the complementizer という [to
I hear the sound of the door closing.

His appearance of drinking at a counter also revealed his loneliness.

Teramura (1977b) classifies nouns of perception as head nouns which function similarly to speech act nouns and nouns of thoughts and feelings. He regards the CNM, where a noun of perception is the head noun, as content-complement outer-relationship CNM. In his theory, content-complement outer-relationship generally includes といる [to iu]. Nouns of perception, however, do not occur with といる [to iu] when the degree of modality of the modifying clause is at its lowest, level one. He tries to explain this contradiction by comparing the Japanese and English languages. He points out that, in English, nouns which show the same semantic characteristics as nouns of perception do not become head nouns of appositive clauses while speech act nouns, nouns of thoughts and feelings, and proposition-taking nouns do. Outer-relationship (=CNH-type) CNM where a noun of perception is the head noun must be translated into English as a prepositional phrase. For example, the modifying part in example (26), ドアが閉まる [doa ga shimaru] ('[the] door closes') is a clause in both Japanese and English. When translating CNM, however, the modifying clause should be changed into a prepositional phrase such as "of the closing door" or "of the door closing." This also applies to example (27). The modifying part in Japanese CNM, カウンターで酒を飲んでいる [kaunta de sake o non-deiru] is a clause, "[someone] is drinking alcohol at a counter," while its English translation is a phrase, "drinking at a counter." Thus, Teramura (1977b) states that the content-complement outer-
relationship CNM, where the head noun is a noun of perception, indicates the different relationship between the modifying clause and its head noun from the other content-complement outer-relationship CNM.

Matsumoto (1988a, b), however, explains CNM where a noun of perception serves as the head noun from alternate perspectives: semantic and pragmatic points of view. She defines the CNM as CNH-type CNM because the relationship between the modifying clause and its head noun is more complicated than NH-type CNM. In example (26), even though the head noun 音 [oto] ('sound') has no clear case relationship with its modifying clause ドアが開まる [doa ga shimaru] ('the door closes'), the head noun encompasses the action described in the modifying clause. That is, a sound usually follows or accompanies the closing of a door. Unlike NH-type CNM head nouns which label the content of the modifying clause, the head noun in example (26), 音 [oto] ('sound') marks the result of the action described by the modifying clause. As discussed in the preceding two sections, it is a significant characteristic of the CNH-type modifying clause that the modifying clause expresses the reason while the modifying clause describes its result.

Example (27) also presents the same characteristics as example (26). The head noun/modifying clause relationship in CNH-type CNM explained here is not as simple as the relationship shown in CH-type and NH-type construction. The modifying clause in example (27) カウンターで酒を飲んでいる [kaunta de sake o nondeiru] ('drinking alcohol at a counter') demands the agent, a person, who performs the action. The head noun 姿 [sugata] ('appearance') metaphorically supplies the person who is drinking at a counter. On the other hand, the head noun also requires clarification regarding what appearance it is. This is similar to head nouns in NH-type CNM. What is expressed by the modifying clause provides enough information to the head noun, too. In addition, what is described in the modifying clause is the motive of the part following the CNM. The appearance of drinking at a counter causes the reader (the
narrator) to feel that loneliness. Between the modifying clause and the matrix clause, the reader notices a cause-effect relationship. Therefore, example (27) also exhibits the same semantic function that relational nouns and quasi-relational nouns exhibit.

This section has examined CNM where the head noun is a noun of perception. Although Teramura (1977b) and Matsumoto (1988a, b) construe the CNM differently, both agree that the complementizer という [to iu] must not be present with nouns of perception. As mentioned in Section 2.1.1, this thesis does not attempt to determine which theory is more persuasive because that issue would go beyond the scope of this study. However, I emphasize the point that wherever a noun of perception functions as the head noun, CNM may be different from other CNH-type CNM where the head noun is either a relational or a quasi-relational noun. The next section discusses exceptions to the general rule that the presence of という [to iu] is unacceptable in CNH-type CNM.

3.2.4 Exceptions to the Rule in CNH-Type CNM

Sections 3.2.1, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3 concern head nouns which do not employ という [to iu] in Japanese CNM: relational nouns, quasi-relational nouns, and nouns of perception respectively. This section discusses two kinds of exceptions to the rule that the presence of という [to iu] is unacceptable in CNH-type CNM. First, I will analyze the syntactic conditions within the modifying clause. Second, I will discuss those CNH-type head nouns which function as NH-type head nouns. Before I discuss these two issues, it should be noted that the modifying clause in CNH-type CNM, where a relational or a quasi-relational noun serves as the head noun, does not show the characteristics of the direct-quote constraint. I repeat Table 12 from Chapter Two here as Table 15 in order to clarify the area this section will discuss:
### Table 15

**The Use of という [to iu]: An Exception in CNH-type CNM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of CNM</th>
<th>NH type CNM</th>
<th>CNH type CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Head Noun</td>
<td>speech act noun</td>
<td>nouns of thoughts and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree of modality</td>
<td>level 5</td>
<td>Direct-Quote (Optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the</td>
<td>level 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of と</td>
<td>level 2</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>いう [to iu]</td>
<td>level 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as former research and my data have shown, CNH-type CNM where the head noun is either a relational noun or a quasi-relational noun never occurs with the modifying clause where the degree of modality is level two and above. Therefore, N/A is placed in the corresponding area. Because of their inherent semantic characteristics, relational nouns and quasi-relational nouns cannot follow the modifying clause where the addressor presents his/her subjectivity. This finding also supports that nouns of perception in CNH-type CNM function differently from relational nouns or quasi-relational nouns: the presence of という [to iu] is sometimes acceptable in CNH-type CNM where nouns of perception serve as the head nouns.

Let us start with the syntactic conditions related to the modifying clause. Note the following examples:
毎日 それを 後悔し続けて、[[この調子 なら 太平洋 mainichi sore o kōkai shi-tuzuke-te, [[kono chōshi nara taiheiyo every day it ACC regret do-continue-ing, [[this manner CON, the Pacific 末 横断しようも とdan shiyō also volitional form of とdan-suru ('to cross') QUE] COMP] appearance CPL-PAST. か という] 様子 だった。 ka to iu] yōsu da-tta. (Because he) continues regretting it every day, he appears as if he could cross the Pacific if he continues regretting it in this way. (Mikeneko hōmuzu no kyōfu-kan.: 8)

[[真青な 空を背に 巨大な 白竜が notautsu to iu] kōkei da-tta. [It was like] a scene [in which] a gigantic white dragon writhed on a background of blue sky. (Matsumoto 1996b:4)

The head nouns in both examples, 様子 [yōsu] ('look, appearance') and 光景 [kōkei] ('scene'), are classified as nouns of perception. Generally, nouns of perception exclude the complementizer という [to iu] in CNH-type CNM. However, the conditions in examples (28) and (29) make という [to iu] direct-quote; という [to iu] is present in CNM where the modifying clause includes the characteristics of a direct quote. Example (28) adequately demonstrates the highest degree of modality within the modifying clause, that is, a question particle か [ka]. The presence of a comma following the modifying clause obligates という [to iu] in example (29).

Terakura (1984) presents another example of CNH-type CNM where という [to iu] precedes a noun of perception even though the modifying clause does not show the characteristics of a direct quote. She hypothesizes that という [to iu] can occur with nouns of perception in CNH-type CNM if the modifying clause comprises a subjective opinion. I cite Terakura's examples to clarify her hypothesis:

(30) [魚を焼いている] 匂い sakana o yai-teiru] nioi [fish ACC grill-ing] smell the smell of grilling fish (Terakura 1984: 43)
It smells like rice or something is burning. (Terakura 1984: 44)

Terakura (1984) claims that a difference both in semantic characteristics and in the usage of the head noun [nioi] ('smell') exists between examples (30) and (31). In example (30), the incident which is expressed by the modifying clause, [sakana o yaku] ('someone grill[s] fish'), and the incident the head noun expresses [nioi] ('smell') occur simultaneously. In example (31), on the other hand, the incident contained in the modifying clause 御飯でも焦げている [gohan demo kogeteiru] ('rice or something is burning') does not always equal the smell the speaker perceives. The speaker perceives the smell, tries to guess what it is, and decides what the smell might be. Accordingly, the modifying clause does not show the speaker's actual perception but rather his/her belief, idea, opinion, or judgement.  

My search for an appropriate example from actual written work, however, did not find an example corresponding to example (31). Rather, CNM where a noun of perception serves as a head noun and the modifying clause expresses the speaker's subjective opinion or judgement does not take という [to iu] but occurs with the phrase ような [yōna] ('to look like') or そうな [sōna] ('to appear'). Observe the following examples:

(32)  
見ていて 楽しくなる ような 姿 では なかった。  
[miteite tanoshiku-naru yōna] sugata de wa na-katta.  
[This] was not an appearance which seemed to make [her] enjoyable.  
(Mikeneko hōmizu no kyōfu-kan.: 195)
As discussed in Section 2.2.4, the type of CNM such as in examples (32) and (33) is defined as an adjectival clause because of its ending. There are two kinds of adjectives in Japanese: one is called an i-adjective or an adjective; the other is a na-adjective or an adjectival noun.\(^\text{13}\) The structure of the modifying clause ending with the phrase ような [yōna] ('to look like') or そうな [sōna] ('to appear') is equivalent to that of an adjectival noun ending with an adjectival phrase. When the phrase ような [yōna] ('to look like') or そうな [sōna] ('to appear') exists between the modifying clause and its head noun, no CNM requires という [to iu] to express the subjective belief, opinion, or judgement of the addressee. Although this issue needs further study to determine whether or not the complementizer という [to iu] can follow the modifying clause in order to express the writer's /speaker's subjective opinion, this problem is beyond the scope of the present study.

Terakura (1984) also points out why another noun of perception 感じ [kanji] ('feeling') can appear with という [to iu] in CNH-type CNM. The following examples present CNM where 感じ [kanji] ('feeling') is a head noun:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(34)} & \quad [\text{脊中 が 冷える}] \begin{cases} \emptyset \end{cases} [\text{感じ が する}]. \\
& \quad [\text{spine NOM get chilly}] \begin{cases} \emptyset \end{cases} \text{sense NOM do.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{[I] feel a chill down my spine. (Terakura 1984: 42)}\]

\(^{13}\)The term, an adjectival noun, is from Martin (1975).
The head noun in examples (34) and (35) is the same: 感じ [kanji] ('feeling'), a noun of perception. Nouns of perception generally do not take という [to iu] between the modifying clause and its head noun. Terakura (1984) analyzes the semantic characteristics and the usage of the head noun in both examples. The event described by the modifying clause and the incident the head noun expresses in example (34) occur at the same time. In example (35), the event described by the modifying clause does not always happen at the same time as the event expressed by the head noun. The addressee notices that person's behavior and then gets the impression that that person is angry at the addressee.

Kim (1989), however, indicates that the word 感じ [kanji] ('feeling') has two meanings: one describes sensory feeling; and the other describes emotional feeling. The meaning influences the presence/absence of という [to iu]. It also differentiates NH-type CNM from CNH-type CNM. As made clear from Terakura's translation, 感じ [kanji] ('feeling') in example (34) expresses sensory feeling. This physical form expresses perception. 感じ [Kanji] ('feeling') in example (35) can be translated into "impression," the mental feeling. Therefore, the head noun in example (35) should be defined as a noun of thoughts and feelings. NH-type CNM takes という [to iu] while the presence of という [to iu] is unacceptable in CNH-type CNM. The same situation occurs when the CNM takes a head noun such as 結果 [kekka] ('result') or 理由 [riyū] ('reason'). As mentioned in Section 3.2.1, such nouns are classified either as proposition-taking nouns or as relational nouns according to the CNM where they appear.
Let us analyze the following actual data in order to confirm Kim's (1989) hypothesis above:

(36)  [首筋 の うしろ が 板 の ように 硬く なった]  感じ
[kubisujin no ushiro ga ita no yōni kataku natta]  kanji

the feeling that nape of [her] neck became as stiff as a board  (Sunūku gari: 124)

(37)  [[何か を 伏せて 剽転な 不良 として ふるまっている]  という]
[[nanika o fuse-te hyōkinna furyō toshite furumatteiru]  to iu]

[kanjī feeling

the feeling that [he] was hiding something and that [he was also] behaving like a facetious and mischievous boy.  (Jidaiya no nyōbo kaidan hen: 196)

The head noun in examples (36) and (37) is the same,感じる [kanji] ('feeling'). 感じ [Kanji] ('feeling') in example (36) expresses sensory feeling, while in example (37) it expresses the mental feeling. Therefore, the head noun of example (36) is a noun of perception, which appears in CNH-type CNM. Example (37)'s head noun, however, is a noun of thoughts and feelings, which exists in NH-type CNM. However, how does the addressee recognize that感じ [kanji] ('feeling') in examples (36) and (37) describes different feelings?

The information expressed by the modifying clause determines whether the head noun感じ [kanji] ('feeling') functions as a noun of perception or as a noun of thoughts and feelings. People can physically perceive the information expressed by the modifying clause in example (36) 首筋の後ろが板のようには硬くなった [kubisujin no ushiro ga ita no yōni kataku natta] ('nape of [her] neck became as stiff as a board'). On the other hand, people cannot sense but can mentally recognize the content described by example (37)'s modifying clause, 何かを伏せて剽転な不良としてふるまっている [nanika o fuse-te hyōkinna furyō toshite furumatteiru] ('[He] was hiding something and [he was also] behaving like a facetious and mischievous boy'). When distinguishing NH- from CNH-type CNM, it should be noted that analyzing the relationship between the head noun and its modifying clause within CNM is the most significant element.
However, the presence/absence of という [to iu] gives the construer a secondary clue in comprehending which type of CNM is used.

### 3.3 Summary

Chapter Three discussed conditions within CNM where the presence of the complementizer という [to iu] is direct-quote and where it is unacceptable. Researchers such as Teramura (1977b), Tomura (1985, 1991), and Tokuda (1989) find that the presence/absence of という [to iu] depends both on the degree of modality in the modifying clause and on the semantic characteristics of the head noun. Speech act nouns generally require という [to iu] obligatorily while relational nouns, quasi-relational nouns, and nouns of perception cannot occur with という [to iu]. When the modifying clause in NH-type CNM retains one or more of the characteristics of an independent clause, the CNM always occurs with という [to iu]. This phenomenon can be explained by Maynard's (1992, 1993) third constraint, direct-quote. Actual written data, however, have revealed exceptions to the general rules above. Sections 2.1.3 and 2.2.4 discussed some examples where these general rules do not work. Particularly, Section 2.1.3 highlighted an example where a speech act noun does not take という [to iu] in NH-type CNM, which will be analyzed in detail in Chapter Four. Section 2.2.4 presented two exceptions to the general rule regarding the use of という [to iu] in CNH-type CNM. One is derived from the syntactic conditions of the modifying clauses, and this exception was discussed in Section 3.1.1. The other exception relates to another function of という [to iu]: という [to iu] is present in order to differentiate NH-type CNM from CH-/CNH-type CNM. Although the difference between NH- and CNH-type CNM can be explained by the constituents within the CNM, a sentence-level examination cannot always distinguish CH-type from NH-type CNM. In addition, it cannot clarify why some NH-type CNM take という [to iu] while others do not. Chapter Four examines these issues in detail.
Chapter Four

Optional という [To iu]

4.0 Introduction

To support the hypothesis that all NH-type CNM take という [to iu] optionally, this chapter discusses NH-type CNM where the modifying clause's degree of modality is at level one. Examples of NH-type CNM discussed in Chapter Three could be explained solely by analyzing the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause and the semantic characteristics of the head noun. However, sentence-level examination cannot always explain the presence/absence of optional という [to iu] discussed in this chapter. Accordingly, this chapter examines the context where the CNM is used. Maynard (1992, 1993) proposes that the presence of optional という [to iu] depends on whether the information described in the modifying clause is foregrounded. The following three constraints foreground what is designated by the modifying clause: (1) new information, (2) dramatic effect, or (3) direct-quote.¹ As discussed in Section 3.1.1, most of the characteristics showing direct-quote constraint were found within and/or outside the modifying clause. Therefore, the examples discussed in this chapter generally relate to the first and the second constraints given above.

Section 4.1 replicates Maynard (1992, 1993) and examines NH-type CNM where the head noun is either a proposition-taking noun or a noun of thoughts and feelings. Section 4.2 analyzes NH-type CNM where a speech act noun occurs without という [to iu]. As discussed in Section 3.1.3, this kind of NH-type CNM was defined as an exception to the general rule that all speech act nouns are present with という [to iu] in NH-type CNM. This section,

¹Collier-Sanuki (personal communication) comments that the modifying clause showing dramatic effect must end with an exclamation mark (!). As Maynard hypothesizes, dramatic effect occurs when the speaker regards the information expressed by the modifying clause as being relatively more important in the discourse than the information designated by its head noun. Therefore, this condition specifically relates to the addressor's attitude, opinion, and/or reaction toward the content of the modifying clause. Analysis of the context where CNM occurs proves indispensable when analyzing how CNM shows dramatic effect. The context also indicates that the modifying clause follows the same theme as the text when showing dramatic effect.
however, uses the contextual analysis based on Maynard's work (1992, 1993), to reveal that it is not an exception and explains why such NH-type CNM occurs.

4.1 NH-Type CNM Where Nouns of Thoughts and Feelings and Proposition-Taking Nouns Serve as the Head Nouns

Following Maynard (1992, 1993), this section investigates NH-type CNM where the head noun is either a proposition-taking noun or a noun of thoughts and feelings. Section 4.1.1 and Section 4.1.2 examine NH-type CNM where proposition-taking nouns and nouns of thoughts and feelings serve as the head noun respectively. The nouns examined in both sections were not analyzed by Maynard (1992, 1993). By analyzing the context where the CNM appears, this section addresses the following questions: (1) why does the same head noun generally occur with という [to iu] in some situations but not in others?; and (2) how does the presence/absence of という [to iu] influence the meaning of a sentence where CNM appears?

4.1.1 Proposition-Taking Nouns


I will start with the following three CNM cited from a detective story. In the story the following three incidents occur: (1) the brand-new clothes at a designer's shop called "Pierre de Blain" are not properly stitched; (2) a fashion model named Shiori Okano is killed; and (3) the

---

2 Comparing them with speech act nouns and nouns of thoughts and feelings, Teramura (1977b) concludes that proposition-taking nouns occur with the modifying clause which does not show the speaker's subjective attitude.
fashion designer at "Pierre de Blain" is killed. The following example is uttered soon after the second incident takes place:

(1) その、[[モデルの 四野瑞織さん が、あの、突然に 急死
sono, [[moderu no okano shiori-san ga, e, ano, totsuzenni kyūshi
well, [[model GEN Ms Shiori Okano NOM, uh, er-r, suddenly sudden death

された] という] 事情 が ございまして...
sareta] to iu] jijō ga gozaimashite...

Well, [because of] the situation that Ms Shiori Okano, a model, uh, er-r, died suddenly...

(Di-shi satsujin jiken: 179)

This statement regarding Shiori's whereabouts is uttered by the coordinator of the competition which Shiori was expected to attend. He has to explain to the judges why she is not present. Because her murder has just been discovered, he expects that none of the judges have yet received the news. In other words, the information expressed by the modifying clause is assumed to be new to or unexpected by the judges. Therefore, the first constraint, new information applies in this case. Hence, optional という [to iu] is deliberately included in the statement.

Optional という [to iu] is absent when the modifying clause provides supplemental information for the head noun. The addressee expects that the information contained in the modifying clause is already known or accepted by the addressee. Observe the following example:
The CNM structure in example (2) would also be grammatically acceptable if という [to iu] preceded the head noun, 事件 [jiken] ('incident'). The statement is uttered during a conversation between two amateur detectives. The detectives, Tahei and Shūsuke, attempt to untangle these three mysteries. Prior to uttering example (2), Shūsuke says, "The incidents are significantly related although it looks like there is no relation at first." Tahei asks him what his statement means because it does not make sense to him. Shūsuke restates that the murder is deeply related to the designer's shop called "Pierre de Blain." Then Tahei utters example (2). Both already know about the three incidents and they recognize that the first and the third incident were connected to "Pierre de Blain." Therefore, Tahei regards the information contained in the modifying clause as shared and old information. Since what is designated in the modifying clause is backgrounded information, optional という [to iu] is omissible before the head noun 事件 [jiken] ('incident') in example (2).

The next example shows that the addressor includes optional という [to iu] when he/she wants to dramatize the information designated by the modifying clause. In order to examine why the addressor intuitively includes という [to iu], the following example requires more context than example (2):

The first CNM in example (2) 一見無関係に見えた、というの [ikken mukankei ni mieta, to iu no] (what appeared - at first glance - to have no connection) contains a comma before という [to iu]. Thus, it is the direct-quote constraint, and という [to iu] is obligatory.

The translation is mine.
Examples (3a, b, c, d) occur at the end of the story where Shūsuke and Tahei review all three mysteries. They have already discovered that the victim in the third incident tried to kill another person but instead she accidentally died. Although both have already shared this information, they insert という [to iu] in examples (3b) and (3c). Note that the description in example (3b)'s modifying clause is much more significant than that described by the head noun because Tahei wants to describe the third incident with a witty remark. Because of the phrase "in a loud voice" in example (3a), the reader senses that the narrator, Tahei, is trying to emphasize example (3b)'s utterance. In addition, the presence of two commas, which precede the CNM in example (3b), indicates that Tahei expresses his utterance, example (3b), in a dramatic way. Accordingly, the presence of optional という [to iu] in example (3b) applies to
the second constraint regarding the inclusion of という [to iu], dramatic effect. In example (3c), Shūsuke does not agree with Tahei because the information contained in the modifying clause of Tahei's sentence is not precise. In example (3d), Shūsuke rephrases his thoughts and states that the criminal cannot be the victim, but that the criminal was killed by the person whom she herself had tried to kill. He contrasts his description of the modifying clause in example (3d) with Tahei's. Therefore, the inclusion of optional という [to iu] by the narrator, Shūsuke, in example (3d) also lends a dramatic element. Furthermore, in both examples (3b) and (3d), Tahei and Shūsuke try to express the third incident as their own comments. This may also fulfill the third constraint regarding the inclusion of という [to iu], direct-quote.

Some proposition-taking nouns such as 結果 [kekka] ('result') can be present as the head noun not only in NH-type but also in CNH-type CNM. The presence of という [to iu] is unacceptable in the CNH-type CNM while the inclusion of という [to iu] is optional in the NH-type CNM. I will prove that という [to iu] can function to distinguish the CNM's type, and that the presence/absence of という [to iu] in such NH-type can be explained by one or more of the conditions Maynard proposes. Example (23) in Section 3.2.1 is repeated here as example (4). Note the non-use of という [to iu] in the following example:

(4) 動物実験 で、 こんど は [AF2 の animal experiment LOC, this time TOP [AF2 GEN 

dōbutsujikken de kondo wa [e-efu-tsū no

hatsugansei o urazukeru] kekka ga dete-shimatta.
cancer-causing ACC support] result NOM come out-finish.

Through animal experimentation, this time [they] have discovered the consequence, which supports the cancer-causing effect of AF2. (Shokuryō: 112)

When not provided with any context, Japanese people accept the presence of という [to iu] after the modifying clause in example (4). They also sense a subtle difference between such

---

6As discussed in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.4, proposition-taking nouns function as relational nouns in CNH-type CNM.
NH-type CNM with and without いう [to iu] but few can explain the reason why. Examining the context where the CNM is included supplies a more conclusive explanation as to why such a difference occurs and why the author chooses to include いう [to iu] in example (4).

Example (4) comes from an article discussing the risk of using a food additive. Although some researchers pointed out that the medicine called AF2 causes genetic damage, the Japanese Ministry of Public Welfare still continued to accept it as an aseptic food additive for two years afterward. The company producing AF2 tried to sue the researchers for libel only to find that their own research yielded the same results. Before reading example (4), the reader has already received the information designated by the modifying clause, AF2の発がん性を裏付ける [ئ-ئع-ئع no hatsukan sei o urazukeru] ('support cancer-causing effect of AF2'). When the information within the modifying clause is assumed to be shared and old information to the reader, it violates the first constraint, new information. Therefore, non-use of いう [to iu] is appropriate in example (4).

By examining the context where the NH-type CNM is included, this section confirmed that Maynard's (1992, 1993) hypothesis applies to NH-type CNM where the head nouns are different proposition-taking nouns from those she examines. The (non-)use of いう [to iu] discussed in this section can be interpreted by one or more of the three constraints that Maynard (1992, 1993) proposes. The next section examines the relationship between optional いう [to iu] and NH-type CNM where the head noun is a noun of thoughts and feelings.

4.1.2 Nouns of Thoughts and Feelings

The following are a few examples of nouns of thoughts and feelings: 思い [omoi] ('thought'), 考え [kangae] ('opinion/idea'), 想像 [sōō] ('imagination'), and 決心 [kesshin]

7I asked fifteen Japanese native speakers whether they recognize the semantic difference between the corresponding CNM with and without いう [to iu]. Three explain the reason: the addressee really regrets the consequence when he/she utters the CNM with いう [to iu].
('decision'). Since Maynard (1992, 1993) examines the relationship between optional [to iu] and 決意 [ketsui] ('decision'), 気 [ki] ('feeling'), and 感じ [kanji] ('feeling'), this section specifically analyzes a different noun of thoughts and feelings, 考え [kangae] ('opinion/idea'). The following two CNM come from the same serial in a newspaper. Observe the use and non-use of という [to iu]:

(5) [[灌漑を充実させて 小麦の生産を]]
[[kangai o fujitsus-ase-te komugi no seisان o]]
[[irrigation ACC make something complete-ing wheat GEN production ACC]]

安定させる] という] 考え
anteis-aseru] to iu ] kangae
make it stable] COMP] opinion
the opinion that [they will] make wheat's production stable by adequate irrigation
(Shokuryo: 222)

(6) [[安価で目の前の豊富なわらを供給する]]
[[yasune de me no mae no hōfuna wara o kyōkyū-suru]]
[cheap price INST eye GEN front GEN abundant straw ACC supply]

考え
kangae
opinion
the opinion that [they could] supply straw cheaply and abundantly right under their very noses
(Shokuryo: 59)

Examples (5) and (6) show the same syntactic features in their respective modifying clauses and employ the same head noun, 考え [kangae] ('opinion'). Syntactic- and semantic-based analyses are insufficient when we consider why the writer of example (5) includes という [to iu] with the CNM and why it does not appear in example (6). In order to answer the question above, I will repeat examples (5) and (6) as examples (7) and (8) by providing the context where both CNM appear respectively. Let us start with example (7):

(7) にもかかわらず、[[灌漑を充実させて 小麦の生産を]]
[[nimokakawarazu, [kangai o fujitsus-ase-te komugi no seisан o]]
however,
[[irrigation ACC make something complete-ing wheat GEN production ACC]]

生産を安定させる] という] 考えは農民にもあまりない。
seisan o anteis-aseru] to iu ] kangae wa nōmin nimo amari nai.
production ACC make it stable] COMP] opinion TOP farmer even much not exist.
However, few farmers have the opinion that [they will] make wheat's production stable by adequate irrigation.
(Shokuryo: 222)
Example (7) comes from an article which discusses an agricultural situation in Australia. The article examines the problem of frequent drought and poor irrigation. If the writer continues the article on the same topic, the reader may deduce what is expressed in the modifying clause, 晴れを充実させて小麦の生産を安定させる [kangai o jūjitsu sasete komugi no seisan o antei saseru] ('that [they will] make wheat production stable by adequate irrigation').

The first word in example (7), にもかかわらず [nimokakawarazu] ('however'), is a conjunction functioning as a paradox and drawing the attention of the reader. The writer tries to bring attention to the modifying clause, and this situation results in the second constraint, dramatic effect, to the addressee. Hence, example (7) includes optional という [to iu] because the content of the modifying clause has dramatic effect and is foregrounded information.

As mentioned above, I will repeat example (6) here as example (8) in a full sentence. Observe the absence of という [to iu]:

(8) [安値 で 目の 前の 豊富な わらを 供给する] [yasune de me no mae no hōfuna wara o kyōkyū-suru] [cheap price INST eye GEN front GEN abundant straw ACC supply]

考えがない ため だ。[kangae ga nai tame da.]

[It is] because they do not have the opinion that they could supply straw cheaply and abundantly right under their very noses. (Shokuryō: 59)

Example (8) is from an article where the writer remarks that the Japanese government's agricultural policy has ignored the power of self-supportiveness. As an example of the government's behavior, the writer introduces the fact that the Japanese government has discouraged farmers from growing and buying feed-crops. The government believes that purchasing imported feed-crops is much cheaper than growing and buying domestic ones. The addressee indicates that the Japanese government neglects to consider the beneficial by-products that would be extracted. Also, the writer lists the benefits the farmers would receive if they grow feed-crops again. The information in example (8)'s modifying clause recognizes one benefit of growing
feed-crops. Since example (8) is narrated as the summary at the end of this article, the author expects the reader to have already absorbed the information expressed in the modifying clause. Therefore, the presence of という [to iu] is inappropriate because of the violation of the first constraint, new information.

The CNM of the following example was already discussed as example (12) in Section 3.1.1. I will repeat it here as example (9) by providing the context. という [to iu]'s presence is preferable in example (9) because the addressor does not want the addressee to misinterpret NH-type as CH-type CNM. Examining the context where the CNM appears explains another reason why the following CNM occurs with optional という [to iu]:

(9) 自国経済 に 対する 計算 だけ ではなく、[[経済 jikoku-keizai ni taisuru keisan dake dewanaku, [[keizai one's country economics DAT toward counting only CPL-not, [[economics

の 相互依存 を 深める ことは、東西 no sōgo-izon o fukameru koto wa, tōzai no GEN mutual dependence ACC deepen thing TOP, East and West GEN

緊張緩和 に 役立つ という 考え に 基づく もの と kinchō kanwa ni yakudatsu] to iu] kangae ni motoduku mono to tension relaxation DAT useful] COMP] idea DAT base thing QUO

見られる。
mir-areru.
see-PASV.

[The flexible interpretation toward COCOM in European countries] is based not only on economic self-interest but also on the opinion that deepening mutual economic dependence is useful in order to ease the tensions between East and West.

(Asahi shinbun August 1, 1987: 5)
(cited in Tokuda 1989: 48)

Observing the whole sentence where example (9) appears, we understand why the addressor includes optional という [to iu]. The topic case marker は [wa] in the modifying clause applies to the third constraint: direct-quote. As discussed in Section 3.1.1, such syntactic characteristics within the modifying clause obligate the inclusion of optional という [to iu] in NH-type CNM. However, analyzing the context which includes the example shows another reason why という
[to iu] occurs in example (9).

Example (9) comes from an editorial which discusses the Japanese government's attitude toward a violation of COCOM by a private Japanese company. Although the writer admits that Japan must regulate COCOM just as other Western countries do, he/she claims that each country can be independent when it conducts trade with Eastern countries. The writer introduces the situation in European countries and wonders why they conduct trade as they do. The information expressed in the modifying clause in example (9), "deepening mutual economic dependence is useful in order to ease the tensions between East and West" is new information to the readers. Optional という [to iu] should be present in example (9) because of the first constraint, new information. Therefore, the addressee includes という [to iu] in example (9) because it functions to foreground the information in the modifying clause as well as to differentiate NH-type CNM from CNH-type CNM.

The following CNM was already discussed in Section 3.2.4 as the example where という [to iu]'s presence distinguishes NH-type CNM from CNH-type CNM. The という [to iu]'s presence, however, should be explained by one or more of the three constraints postulated by Maynard (1992, 1993). Providing the context where the example is stated, I will discuss how the information of the modifying clause is foregrounded.

(10) 山小屋 で の ありよう から、 [[何か を 伏せて 創業人]]
Yamagoya LOC GEN state because, ([[something ACC hide-ing facetious
不良 として ふるまっている] [という]]
bad as behave-ing]

As a result of his behavior at the Yamagoya [coffee shop], [she] felt that he not only was hiding something, but that he also behaved like a facetious and mischievous boy.

(Jidaiya no nyōbo kaidan hen: 196)
When examining the overall structure of the sentence, example (10) is grammatically correct regardless of という [to iu]'s presence. The sentence comes from a story where the heroine encounters several mysterious situations during a journey. One of the strangest events occurs when she meets a middle-aged man at a coffee shop called Yamagoya. Before narrating example (10), she continues wondering what he does for a living and why he appears whenever she needs him. Owing to former parts of the story, not only the heroine but also the reader knows how the man behaves at the coffee shop. When the reader encounters example (10), he/she feels that the description of the modifying clause, 何かを伏せて剣軽な不良としてふるまっている [nanika o fusete hyōkinna furyō toshite furumatteiru] ('[he] was hiding something and [he also] behaved like a facetious and mischievous boy') is not a common expression referring to the man's personality. This is especially true because of the combination of the adjective 剣軽な [hyōkinna] ('facetious') and the noun 不良 [furyō] ('delinquent'). This fulfills the second constraint, dramatic effect. In addition, the reader also feels that the heroine herself is trying to express her own opinion regarding how the man behaves. This applies to the third constraint, direct-quote. The presence of という [to iu] is more appropriate in example (10) for the two reasons above.

This section explained how the addressor determined whether or not to include optional という [to iu] in NH-type CNM when a noun of thoughts and feelings serves as the head noun. As discussed in Section 3.3.1, optional という [to iu]'s presence depends on whether the addressor regards certain information expressed in the modifying clause as foregrounded or backgrounded. Determining whether or not to include という [to iu] in an optional situation requires an investigation regarding the context in which the CNM occurs. The next section examines the relationship between optional という [to iu] and CNM where the head noun is a speech act noun. Speech act nouns generally occur with という [to iu]. By analyzing the

---

*Eleven out of fifteen Japanese native speakers prefer the inclusion of という [to iu] in example (10).*
context in which the CNM appears, this study refutes the argument that speech act nouns always require という [to iu] obligatory.

4.2 NH-Type CNM where Speech Act Nouns Serve as Head Nouns

This section verifies that Maynard's (1992, 1993) three constraints on the presence of optional という [to iu] apply to NH-type CNM where a speech act noun serves as the head noun. Maynard (1992, 1993), however, does not examine NH-type CNM where a speech act noun occurs with optional という [to iu] as the head noun. She claims that the presence of という [to iu] is obligatory when the head noun is a speech act noun. I divide this section into halves in order to prove that a speech act noun can occur with optional という [to iu] in NH-type CNM as do nouns of thoughts and feelings and proposition-taking nouns. Section 4.2.1 analyzes NH-type CNM where the head noun is 話 [hanashi] ('story'). Section 4.2.2 focuses on NH-type CNM where 聞 [uwasa] ('rumor') and 約束 [yakusoku] ('promise') serve as the head nouns. 話 [Hanashi] ('story') often occurs without という [to iu] in NH-type CNM, while 聞 [uwasa] ('rumor') and 約束 [yakusoku] ('promise') are usually regarded as head nouns which require という [to iu] obligatorily. Contextual analysis is indispensable to a comprehension of NH-type CNM where a speech act noun serves as the head noun and occurs without という [to iu].

4.2.1 話 [Hanashi] ('story')

This section examines the head noun 話 [hanashi] ('story') and optional という [to iu] in NH-type CNM. It is widely accepted that some speech act nouns such as 話 [hanashi] ('story') do not occur with という [to iu] in NH-type CNM. This thesis proposes that every speech act

*The following are some examples of hypotheses proposed by some researchers in order to explain the findings above. Teramura (1977b) classifies some speech act nouns such as 話 [hanashi] ('story') as proposition-taking nouns because he theorizes that all speech act nouns require という [to iu] obligatorily regardless of the degree of modality of the modifying clause. Tomura (1985, 1991) claims that という [to iu] is not present when the addressor uses 話 [hanashi] ('story') to introduce a story: it focuses the flow on the whole story and does not need encapsulating. When 話 [hanashi] ('story') "encapsulates," という [to iu] is present and it functions to dramatize
noun can occur without という [to iu] if the information expressed in the modifying clause is not foregrounded.

Let us start with the NH-type CNM without という [to iu]. Consider the following example:

(11) [jukensei o motsu hito ga kaiinu no nodo o shujutsu-shite, hoe-nu inu o tsukutta] hanashi mo

heard thing NOM exist.

[I] have heard the story that people whose child is a student preparing for an entrance examination had the throat of their dog operated on to make it unable to bark.

(Usagi no sakadachi: 207)

Example (11) comes from an essay commenting on humanity's selfish attitude toward animals. Beginning with Japanese people's fanaticism regarding whether or not Pandas in the zoo can have offspring every year, the author doubts that they will mate because they are tired of being watched. The author states that human beings are "inhuman" to animals and lists other examples which show how humans treat animals in selfish and cruel ways. Example (11) appears as the fourth example in her essay. Even though this information, という [to iu] is new to the reader, the information follows the essay's main theme so that it is not totally new information. Since it the content of the modifying clause. Kim (1989) follows Teramura's classification of these speech act nouns. She points out that the inclusion or exclusion of という [to iu] is influenced by the addressee's psychological distance from what is expressed by the modifying clause. Tokuda (1989) speculates that speech act nouns do not always occur with という [to iu] in NH-type CNM. She subcategorizes speech act nouns and nouns of thoughts and feelings according to how easily という [to iu] is omitted in NH-type. Oshima (1991) claims that という [to iu] is obligatory when the head noun 話 [hanashi] ('story') is used to express hearsay. However, という [to iu] is optional when the modifying clause expresses a summary of the story.
violates the first constraint, new information, という [to iu] is not included in example (11).

The next example shows the presence of という [to iu]:

(12) [[いわゆる 老人ボケ の ような 病気 に なった ひと
[iwayuru rōjin-boke no yōna byōki ni natta hito
[[what is called Alzheimer's disease GEN look like disease DAT became people
を、息子 や 娘 が てれずに 抱きしめたりして いたわる
o, musuko ya musume ga terezuni dakishimetari-shite itawaru
ACC, son and daughter NOM without hesitation hug closely-ing console
うち に 治った] という] 話 が どこか の 新聞 に
uchi ni naotta] to iu] hanashi ga dokoka no shinbun ni
while DAT recovered] COMP] story NOM someplace GEN newspaper DAT
でていた。
deteita.
appeared.

There was a story in some newspaper that people who had suffered from illnesses such as Alzheimer's disease got well when their sons and daughters and so on hugged them closely without hesitation. (Usagi no sakadachi: 34)

The presence of optional という [to iu] in this example can be explained by Maynard's first constraint, new information. Prior to this example sentence, nothing was mentioned about Alzheimer's disease. The only matter discussed was the fact that women prefer fur coats. Although these two pieces of information are related by the topic of physical contact. There is still a jump of logic from the women's preference to the cure of Alzheimer's disease. Therefore, the information contained in this CNM is still considered new and unexpected to the reader. Thus optional という [to iu] must be used in example (12).

という [To iu]'s inclusion in example (13) demonstrates the second constraint, dramatic effect:
The author writes about the relationship between the people of Kyoto and its sightseers. She has already mentioned that many Japanese people love to visit Kyoto, but that the people in Kyoto remain somewhat cool and aloof toward these transients. The content expressed in the modifying clause, ある東京人で、ひとりで京都へいくとホテルに泊まり、ホテルの食堂でしか食事しないひとがいる ['there is a person, a certain Tokyoite, who, when he/she goes to Kyoto, stays in a hotel and dines nowhere except in the hotel dining room') is an extreme case which shows how apprehensive tourists can be in Kyoto. Accordingly, the addressor permits the use of optional という [to iu] to create a dramatic effect. There is another reason for いう [to iu]'s presence in example (13). Because of the main clause's predicate, 聞いたことがある [kiita koto ga aru] ('[I] have heard'), the reader can recognize that somebody has actually uttered the information given in the modifying clause to the author, and that the author is recalling it while expressing example (13). Therefore, as shown in example (13), an analysis based on the context is sometimes essential to reveal the direct-quote constraint although features identifying the constraint are found within the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause.

King (personal communication) points out that the presence of いう [to iu] in example (13) is because of new information as well as of dramatic effect. Also, as mentioned in footnote One in Chapter Four, Collier-Sanuki comments that the modifying clause in example (13) must end with an exclamation mark (!) when uttered.
The following two examples come from a short story where a writer talks about the activities of his literary circle during his high school days. He and his friends regularly wrote novels, mimeographed them, and sold them to their friends at a low price. Six examples of NH-type CNM use the head noun 話 [hanashi] ('story') in the novel. One requires という [to iu] obligatorily because of the comma between the modifying clause and its head noun. This study analyzes the other five examples. Since という [to iu] remains optional in these situations, one example appears with and the other four appear without という [to iu]. Observe the first example where the head noun 話 [hanashi] ('story') follows という [to iu]:

(14) 「不可能 マシン」 という の は、 [[スイッチを 入れる と、 その "fukando mashin" to iu no wa, [[suitchi o ireru to, sono "impossible machine" called NMR TOP, [[switch ACC switch on COND, that

人物 が その 時 より 少し 以前 へ 行ってしまう タイムマシン を
jinbutsu ga sono toki yori sukoshi izen e itte-shimau taimumashin o
person NOM that time than a little before LOC go-finish time machine ACC

発明した 博士 が、 スイッチを 入れる と ちょっと前 へ
hatsumeishita hakase ga, suitchi o ireru to chotto mae e
invented doctor NOM, switch ACC switch on CON a little before LOC
go back-finish because at all cost invention ACC complete thing NOM

[The story] titled "Impossible Machine" is the story about a doctor who invented a time machine. The machine enables a person to go back to the time just before switching on the machine. Therefore, whenever he switches on the machine, he goes back to the time when he is about to do the same action. As a result, he cannot complete his invention no matter what he does.

(Iesutadei:25)

The syntactic structure of the modifying clause provides one potential reason for という [to iu]'s presence in example (14). Terakura (1984) and Tokuda (1989) postulate that if the modifying clause comprises a complex sentence, it tends to take という [to iu]. Similarly, although she does not discuss this in detail, Tokuda (1989) observes a tendency that the more
complex and the longer the modifying clause is, the more often optional という [to iu] is used between the modifying clause and its head noun. Terakura's and Tokuda's postulation can be equivalent to the third constraint, direct-quote. It is worth noting, however, that the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause discussed here, the complex sentence, do not always occur with optional という [to iu] as do the other syntactic features such as the presence of a comma. It is the narrator of the sentence where the corresponding CNM is included who determines whether or not the complex sentence shows the characteristics of a direct quote.

When the addressor includes optional という [to iu] before the modifying clause which comprises the complex sentence, the presence of という [to iu] gives the modifying clause a more "vivid image" than that without という [to iu].

The second example is NH-type CNM where the head noun 'story' does not occur with という [to iu]:

(15) 「奇跡を起こす男」 というの は、 [どんな ことでも 口 に "kiseki o okosu otoko" to iu no wa, [donna koto demo kuchi ni "miracle ACC cause man" called NMR TOP, [any thing even mouth DAT 出して 命じれば その とおりになる 男 が、工事現場 dashi-te mejire-ba sono tōri ni naru otoko ga, kōji-genba put out-ing order-CON that way DAT become man NOM, a site of construction で 事故 に 会い、なにも できなくなる] 話 である。 de jiko ni ai, nanimo deki-naku-naru] hanashi dearu.
LOC accident DAT meet, anything can do-not-become] story CPL.

The story titled "The Man Who Causes Miracles" is the story that the man who could make anything possible simply by ordering it had an accident at a construction site and became unable to do anything.

(iesutadai:15)

Compared to example (14), example (15)'s syntactic structure is less complex. The absence of optional という [to iu] is preferable in example (15) because the modifying clause does not show the characteristics of a direct quote. It briefly summarizes the content of the story. In addition, the violation of the first constraint, new information, also explains why example (15) does not include という [to iu]. The author repeatedly introduces the stories he and his friends wrote in their literary magazine. Therefore, the addressee can regard the
modifying clause's information as old information even though he/she encounters a summary of each story for the first time. They can expect the information of the modifying clause because of the story's context. Optional という [to iu] is excluded in example (15) because the content of the modifying clause is backgrounded by the two constraints above.

To confirm that the findings discussed in this section hold true for other examples, this section also analyzes examples other researchers cited from written data. The following is from Kim (1989):

(16) はじめ は、娘 と 京子郎 を めあわせる] 話 も あった

*at first* TOP, [daughter COM Kyojiro ACC marry] story also existed

At first [people talked about] the story [and speculated] that [Shizu would] marry her daughter to Kyojiro, but...

Example (16) does not include optional という [to iu] because it violates the first constraint, new information. The author in example (16) continually narrates the story from a dance critic's point of view. She uses a critic's monologue in the descriptive part. The heroine of the story, Shizu, used to be the head of a traditional Japanese dance school. The critic reviews Shizu's personal history and recalls the episode between her daughter and Kyojiro. Although the content in the modifying clause in example (16), 娘と京子郎をめあわせる [musume to keijiro o meawaseru] ('[Shizu would] marry her daughter to Kyojiro') is new to the reader, it is old information to the narrator, the critic. Therefore, the addressee includes という [to iu].

Oshima (1991) hypothesizes that the semantic characteristics of the word 話 [hanashi] ('story') determine the presence/absence of optional という [to iu]. He claims that the CNM requires という [to iu] obligatorily when the head noun 話 [hanashi] ('story') expresses hearsay. However, という [to iu] is optional when the content of the modifying clause describes a
summary of the story. The following example is in Oshima (1991):

(17) [バリバリ [haribari] の キャリアウーマン [no kyariaūman] が、 [onomatopoeia to express 'working very hard' GEN career woman NOM, 自分 より もう少し 有能 で 理屈っぽい 男 から、「きみ って [jibun yori mō sukoshi yūnō de rikutsuppoi otoko kara, "kimī tte oneself than a little bit talented LOC argumentative man from, " you COMP かわいいね と 一言 いわれた だけ で コロリ と [kawaii ne” to hitokoto iwa-re-ta dake de korori to cute SF” QUO one phrase tell-PASV-PAST only LOC easily QUO 参ってしまう] 話 が レディスコミック に よく [maitte-shimau] hanashi ga redisu-komikku ni yoku be captivized-finish] story NOM women's comic magazine DAT often あります。 [arimasu. exist.

[We can] find that stories [featuring] hard-working career women romantically enamoured with logical, persuasive men, slightly more successful than [they are, and which contain] the simple little phrase "You're cute, you know?" are exceedingly common in women's comic magazines. (Ren-airon: 65) (cited in Oshima 1991: 56)

As discussed in examples (14) and (15), however, the actual written data refute Oshima's assumption that only the semantic characteristics of the head noun determine optional [to iu]'s use. The absence of という [to iu] in example (17) shows the violation of the first constraint, new information.

Example (17) comes from an essay written by a very popular female comic book writer. In the essay, she counsels a woman who loves a man six years younger than she is. Example (17) follows the author's interpretation of why the woman considers her situation troubling. The author points out that the woman subconsciously believes that men should always be superior to women and states that a woman generally looks for this in a prospective partner. In addition, the author claims that this happens because of this woman's gender stereotyping. The modifying clause in example (17) expresses a typical narrative in a Japanese women's comic. The heroine of the story is influenced by social convention. The author expects her advisee, as
well as other readers, to be familiar with this scenario. She regards the information described by the modifying clause as shared and expected information to both of them. Therefore, the presence of optional という [to iu] is not appropriate in example (17) because the information expressed in the modifying clause is not foregrounded.

This section confirmed that NH-type CNM without optional という [to iu] where the head noun is 話 [hanashi] ('story') can be explained by the three constraints proposed by Maynard (1992, 1993) as do proposition-taking nouns and nouns of thoughts and feelings. As examined above, comprehending optional という [to iu] strongly depends on contextual information. In turn, whether or not the addressee includes optional という [to iu] influences the message contained in NH-type CNM. If optional という [to iu] is present, the information contained in the modifying clause is foregrounded. The head noun is foregrounded if optional という [to iu] is absent. The next section examines the absence of optional という [to iu] in NH-type CNM where other speech act nouns, 婦 [uwasa] ('rumor') and 約束 [yakusoku] ('promise') serve as the head nouns.

4.2.2 Speech Act Nouns

This section examines NH-type CNM which was introduced as an exception to the general rule in Section 3.1.3. I repeat example (17) from Section 3.1.3 here as example (18). Note という [to iu]'s absence in the example:

(18) [そういう 全盛 の 官員さん の 家 で]
[sōiu zensei no kan'insan no ie de]
[like that the zenith of prosperity GEN government clerk GEN house LOC]

お縁さん 同様に かわいがられて 色気がしている] 婦
ojōsan dōyonī kawaiigarete eyō shi-teiru] uwasa
mademoiselle similarly love-PASV-ing luxury doing] rumor
stories [rumor in the literal translation] that showed [Suga was] cherished as a daughter in the home of this government official now at the height of his influence

(Onnazaka: 36. Translation by John Bester 1984)
(cited in Takahashi 1979: 68)

As discussed in Section 2.1.3, analysis within the CNM cannot explain why the absence of とい
5. [to iu] is most appropriate in example (18). In order to answer the question above, Tokuda (1989) compares example (18) to an example of CNM which precedes example it:

(19) [[県令 川島 が
kenrei no kawashima ga
[governor GEN Kawashima NOM

警視総監
keishisōkan
Superintendent-General of the Metropolitan Police Academy DAT

に 役転した
ni eitenshita
promoted

の に 従って 上京して から も 白川 は ひきつづき
no ni shitagatte tokyōshit-e kara no shirakawa wa hikitsuzuki
NMR DAT follow-ing move to Tokyo-ing after also Shirakawa TOP continuously

警視庁
keishichō
the Metropolitan Police Academy GEN

の 利け者 で、 吉原
no kikemono de, yoshiwara
a man of influence CPL, Yoshiwara

の 遊郭 から 上がる 内々 の 税 だけでも、 大した 実入り
do yūkaku kara agaru uchiuchi no zei dake demo, taishita miiri
GEN gay quarters from come private GEN taxes only even, highly profits

だ] と いう [to iu] うわさ である。
day comp rumor CPL.

After [they] moved to the capital in the wake of Governor Kawashima, newly promoted to Superintendent-General of the Metropolitan Police, Shirakawa had become an important official at the Metropolitan Police Academy and was rumored to be living in high style on the taxes privately collected from the Yoshiwara gay quarters.

(Onnazaka: 36. Translation by John Bester 1984)
(cited in Tokuda 1989: 52)

Tokuda (1989) claims that the presence of という [to iu] is obligatory in example (19) because the modifying clause is a complex sentence. Also, she states that the absence of という [to iu] in example (18) results from the fact that the modifying clause does not include the characteristics of a direct quote. It briefly summarizes the content of the rumor. However, I suggest another reason for the non-use of optional という [to iu] in example (18) as well as its use in example (19).

In example (19), the modifying clause shows the following three characteristics of a direct quote: the topic particle は [wa], a high degree of modality shown by the copula だ [da],
and a complex sentence. Particularly, the presence of the topic particle and the copula necessitates the inclusion of optional という [to iu] in NH-type CNM. In order to explain why example (18) does not take という [to iu], I will add the following part of example (18) as follows and provide the context where the sentence is used:

(20) そういう 全盛 の 官員さん の 家 で
[soi u zensei no kan’in-san no ie de]
like that the zenith of prosperity GEN government clerk GEN house LOC
お嬢さん 同様に かわいがられて 業績 している] 嘲 を
ojosan doyni kawai gararete eyo shiteiru uwasa o
mademoiselle similarly love-PASV-ing luxury doing] rumor ACC
きけば 母おや も ほかほか たのしい 気 になるのである
kike-ba hahayo mo hokahoka tanoshii ki ni naru-no-dearu
listen-CON mother also warmly enjoyable feeling DAT become-EMO-CPL

As discussed by Tokuda (1989), the violation of the third constraint, direct-quote, determines という [to iu]'s absence. However, という [to iu]'s absence in example (20) can be explained by another violation of Maynard's constraints. The information expressed by example (20) is not new. This example comes from a story where Suga became a government official's concubine because of the poverty of her family. The author repeatedly narrates that since Suga became his concubine, she bought anything she liked regardless of the cost. Therefore, what is expressed in the modifying clause そういう全盛の官員さんの家でお嬢さん同様にかわいがられて業績している [soi u zensei no kan’in san no ie de ojosan doyni kawai gararete eyo shiteiru] ('[Suga was] cherished as a daughter in the home of this government official now at the height of his influence') is old and expected information to the reader as well as to Suga's mother. As expected, her mother constantly worries about her. Optional という [to iu] is absent in example
(20) because it violates the new information constraint and direct-quote.

In order to confirm Maynard's (1992, 1993) theory from a different perspective, I will examine CNM where the head noun is a different speech act noun. Section 3.1.1 introduced NH-type CNM where the speech act noun 約束 [yakusoku] ('promise') occurs with という [to iu] when its modifying clause's degree of modality is lowest, at level one. Example (19) in Section 1.2.2 is repeated here as example (21). I will add the following part of the CNM and analyze the context where the example is included in order to comprehend why optional という [to iu] is present in the example:

(21) [[少し でも 気分 が 悪く なったら すぐ に 帰る] という な 約束 を して やっと 許してもらった]

By making the promise that [she will] return [to the hospital] as soon as [she] starts to feel ill, she was barely allowed [by her mother to go to a violin concert].

(Kodomo no tonari: 39)

The two constraints, new information and direct-quote, explain という [to iu]'s presence in example (21). In the story that includes example (21), a patient in another room invites a girl in the hospital to a violin concert. Her mother hesitates to let her go because of the child's physical condition. What the modifying clause expresses, 少しでも気が悪くなったらすぐに帰る [sukoshi demo kibun ga waruku nattara sugu ni kaeru] ('[she will] come back [to the hospital] as soon as [she] starts to feel ill') is new information to the reader as well as to the heroine of the story, the sick girl. In addition, the entire story is narrated from the sick girl's point of view. When reading the story, the reader instinctively feels the effect of a small girl talking directly to him or to her. Because of these two constraints, the information contained in the modifying clause is foregrounded and the presence of という [to iu] is appropriate in this situation.
The following CNM is another NH-type CNM where the head noun is a speech act noun 約束 [yakusoku] ('promise'). Note the absence of optional という [to iu]:

(22) 今日 は、 会社 が ひけて から、 待ちあわせて 食事
[kyō wa, kaisha ga hike-te kara, machiawase-te shokuji]
[Today TOP, company NOM close-ing after, meet by appointment-ing dinner]

に ゆく] 約束 な の を 思い出した。
[DAT go] promise CPL NMR ACC remembered.

[Kuno] remembered the promise that today he would meet [Reiko] again and dine out after work.

という [To iu]'s in example (22) applies to the violation of the first constraint, new information. In example (22), a young company employee, Kuno, has a streak of forgetfulness. He has just been scolded by his boss since he had forgotten a promise made to his client. Reiko, who is a co-worker and his girlfriend, shows her sympathy and encouragement by exchanging glances with him. At that time, he finds himself recalling his promised date with her that night. Although the information expressed in example (22)'s modifying clause is new and unexpected to the reader, it is old information to Kuno himself. Since the author keeps narrating the story from Kuno's point of view, determining whether the information is new or old should be consistent with how Kuno defines the corresponding information. Accordingly, optional という [to iu] is absent in example (22).

This section examined examples of NH-type CNM where the head noun is a speech act noun. The presence/absence of という [to iu] in all examples could be explained by the three constraints proposed by Maynard (1992, 1993). Contextual analysis is always indispensable in order to see which constraint determines the use of optional という [to iu]. Although most features demonstrating direct-quote constraint are found within the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause, this section showed some examples of NH-type CNM where only an analysis based on the context reveals the direct-quote constraint. These findings proved the hypothesis of this thesis that all NH-type CNM take という [to iu] optionally. In addition,
because of the semantic characteristics of speech act nouns, some modifying clauses discussed here showed one or more of the characteristics of a direct quote.

4.3 Summary

This chapter discussed NH-type CNM where the modifying clause's degree of modality is at level one. When analyzing actual written data, this thesis adopts Maynard's (1992, 1993) hypothesis that optional という [to iu] is included when the information described in the modifying clause shows one or more of the following three constraints: (1) new information, (2) dramatic effect, and (3) direct-quote. By employing her three constraints, this chapter confirmed my proposal that all NH-type CNM take という [to iu] optionally. The data analysis in Section 4.1 reconfirmed the previous researchers' claims that という [to iu]'s presence is optional in NH-type CNM when nouns of thoughts and feelings and proposition-taking nouns serve as the head nouns. On the other hand, Section 4.2 clarified the hypothesis of this thesis that speech act nouns can function similarly to nouns of thoughts and feelings and proposition-taking nouns in NH-type CNM. By examining the actual written data, both sections revealed that Maynard's first and second constraints, new information and dramatic effect, cannot be explained without knowing the context in which the CNM occurs. Although the third constraint, direct-quote, can often be explained within the syntactic structures of the modifying clause, contextual analysis is indispensable in order to comprehend the presence of という [to iu] in some NH-type CNM.
Chapter Five
Conclusion

5.1 Summary

This thesis examined the optional use and functions of the Japanese complementizer という [to iu] in Japanese CNM. The presence of という [to iu] between the modifying clause and its head noun can be obligatory, optional, or even unacceptable. The goal of this thesis was to examine and clarify the semantic differences between CNM with and without optional という [to iu]. This study also proposed that comprehending the use and functions of optional という [to iu] requires knowledge of the context in which the particular CNM occurs.

In order to achieve the goal of this thesis, Chapter One: Background of the Study, reviewed previous studies on the relationship between Japanese CNM and という [to iu]. These researches generally focused on structures within the CNM such as the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause and the semantic characteristics of the head nouns. This thesis reconfirmed Maynard's (1992, 1993) claim that analysis within the CNM alone and sentence level analysis cannot always explain the presence/absence of という [to iu] in NH-type CNM. Employing Matsumoto's (1988a, b) CNM classification (CH-/NH-/CNH-type CNM) and Maynard's Discourse Modality Indicator, Chapter Two hypothesized that all NH-type CNM take という [to iu] optionally. Following Maynard, Chapter Three and Chapter Four examined actual written data and analyzed the context in which the CNM was stated. Chapter Three re-examined the conditions which do or do not necessitate the complementizer という [to iu] in NH/CNH-type CNM. By analyzing the data, I concluded that the syntactic characteristics identified by other researchers as requiring という [to iu] obligatorily belong to Maynard's third distributional constraint, direct-quote. As evidence to support the hypothesis that all NH-type CNM take という [to iu] optionally, Chapter Four examined NH-type CNM where the degree of modality of the modifying clause is at its lowest, level one. Explaining which distributional
constraint(s) permits optional いう [to iu] to be present in NH-type CNM requires analysis of the context in which the CNM occurs.

5.2 Suggestions for Further Study

My findings present optional いう [to iu]'s distributional constraints and conclude that all NH-type CNM occur with いう [to iu] optionally. Whether or not the addressor includes optional いう [to iu] in NH-type CNM depends on his/her perception of the information. The addressor includes いう [to iu] when he/she wants to focus attention on the modifying clause and excludes it when focusing attention on the head noun. The following three distributional constraints, (1) new information, (2) dramatic effect, (3) direct-quote, determine the inclusion of optional いう [to iu] in NH-type CNM. Identifying the first and second constraints, new information and dramatic effect, requires an examination of the context in which the CNM occurs. Although some features regarded as the third constraint, direct-quote, are found within the syntactic characteristics of the modifying clause, others require an analysis based on the context as discussed in Chapter Four.

Some issues regarding いう [to iu] remain unresolved and deserve further study. See the following Table:
Table 16
The use of という [to iu]: Issues not Discussed in This Thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of CNM</th>
<th>NH-type CNM</th>
<th>CNH-type CNM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Head Noun</td>
<td>speech act noun</td>
<td>nouns of thoughts and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree of modality and the use of いう [to iu]</td>
<td>level 5</td>
<td>Optional -(Direct-Quote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 16, this study does not analyze data concerning NH-type CNM where the degree of modality of the modifying clause is at level two. It is ambiguous whether or not one of level two modality, epistemic modality, exhibits the characteristics of a direct quote. Before verifying my hypothesis that all NH-type head nouns take いう [to iu] optionally, this study should determine whether or not, in CNM, Japanese native speakers regard a modifying clause which shows epistemic modality as a direct quote.

Another highlighted section in Table 16 concerns CNH-type CNM. I did not find any CNH-type CNM where the head noun is either a relational or a quasi-relational noun and where the modifying clause shows a level two degree of modality or above. This finding suggests that in CNH-type CNM, the information expressed in the modifying clause loses the characteristics of a direct quote. Nouns of perception, however, function differently from the other CNH-type head nouns when the modifying clause's degree of modality shows level two and above. They always occur with いう [to iu] in CNH-type CNM where the modifying clause's degree of modality is level three or above. On the other hand, as discussed in Section 3.2.4, although they do not generally occur with いう [to iu], nouns of perception follow よう
な [yōna] ('to look like') and そうな [sōna] ('to appear') when the modifying clause's degree of modality is at level two.

As discussed in Section 2.1, Teramura (1977b) and Matsumoto (1988a, b) categorize CNM differently. The presence and/or absence of the complementizer という [to iu] in CNM is one of the important factors to categorize Japanese CNM, although this thesis does not discuss which CNM framework is more thorough. Employs Matsumoto's framework would require why nouns of perception function differently from the other CNH-type head nouns when the degree of modality of the modifying clause is at level two and above. Even had we employed Teramura's proposal, which regards the CNM as NH-type CNM, we would be left with the problem of why nouns of perception must not occur with という [to iu] in CNM where the degree of modality of the modifying clause is at level one. Further analyses based on more data are necessary to explain CNM where a noun of perception serves as the head noun.

Although the data examined in this pilot study was limited in scope to written data, in future I plan to analyze data concerning both written and spoken practices in order to confirm the hypothesis advanced in this thesis. In order to examine spoken data, it is necessary to determine whether or not the variants of という [to iu] such as つっていう [tte iu], いったった [tte itta], and つって [tte] function similarly to という [to iu] in NH-/CNH-type CNM. Also, in order to provide a clear understanding of the complementizer という [to iu], examining other uses of という [to iu] will prove beneficial: という [to iu] which functions to quote an utterance directly or indirectly, and という [to iu] which combines two nouns. These questions are as challenging as they are profound, but the research on these issues will inevitably lead to a fuller understanding of the Japanese language.
Data Sources
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